DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 262 UD 011 747

AUTHOR	Dishart, Martin
TITLE	An Evaluation of the 1970 Summer Enrichment Programs of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia.
INSTITUTION	District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 70
NOTE	191p.; Prepared by the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Negro Students, *Program Evaluation, Recreational Programs, Resident Camp Programs, Science Programs, Special Programs, *Summer Programs, Summer Schools, Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	District of Columbia Public Schools

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the 1970 Summer Enrichment Programs for the Public Schools of the District of Columbia. There were 35 programs with a very wide range of purposes, involving 21,555 students. These much needed programs for student achievement and enrichment could only have taken place during the summer. A few were exemplary programs, but some of the programs also had weaknesses. By and large, the programs were essentially good, but had room for improvement. The report itself is in three sections. There is a short but important introduction in Part One comprised of evaluation considerations and finances. Each program is described and evaluated in detail in Part Two. There is an overview, evaluations of all the programs, and summarized recommendations in Part Three. (Author/JW)

AN EVALUATION OF THE 1970 SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ED0 54262

by

MARTIN DISHART, PH.D.
Evaluation Consultant

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

in cooperation with
MILDRED P. COOPER, ED.D.

DIVISION OF PLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

VD 011747

November 1970

FOREWORD

This report evaluates the 1970 Summer Enrichment Programs for the Public Schools of the District of Columbia. There were 35 programs with a very wide range of purposes, involving 21,555 students, and using $675,000 of appropriated District of Columbia Public School Funds. The programs were coordinated by Mrs. Marguerite Seldon, Assistant Superintendent for Summer School and Continuing Education. This report represents a continuation of the efforts made by the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation to describe and evaluate the District of Columbia Summer Enrichment Programs beginning in the summer of 1966.

These very much needed programs for student achievement and enrichment could only have taken place during the summer. A few were exemplary programs. Many of the programs had good exemplary aspects along with program weaknesses. Some of the strengths were outstanding. Some of the problems were unavoidable or were due to understandable errors. Some of the problems were very avoidable and responsibility for them has been identified wherever possible. For these reasons, many programs are referred to in the chapter sections identifying program accomplishments and exemplary strengths as well as the sections which point out problems and sources of blame. This is as it should be for programs which were essentially good but had room for improvements.

This report is in three sections. There is a short but important introduction in Part One. Each program is described and evaluated in detail in Part Two. There is an overview, evaluations of all the programs, and summarized recommendations in Part Three.

Credit for invaluable aid in obtaining the data for these evaluations is deservedly due to each of the Summer Enrichment Program directors and many of their staff, to Mrs. Marguerite Seldon and her staff, to Dr. Mildred Cooper for her evaluative assistance and advice, and to Mrs. Sarah Milholland and Mrs. Julia Mark for their research and editorial assistance. The author takes full responsibility for all evaluative findings in this report and will be personally responsible for correcting any inaccuracies.

Martin Dishart, Ph.D.
Author and Evaluation Consultant

CONTENTS

		PAGE
FOREWORD		1
	PART ONE	
	INTRODUCTION	
CHAPTER 1.	INTRODUCTION TO THIS REPORT	6
	Some Evaluation Considerations	7
	What to Evaluate.	7
	Money Spent and Program Costs	8
	Better Cost Records	9
	Evaluation Planning Should Begin With Program Planning.	9
CHAPTER 2.	PURPOSES OF THE 35 SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS	10
	PART TWO	
	A REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF EACH 1970 SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
CHAPTER 3.	AFRICAN STUDIES	19
CHAPTER 4.	ANACOSTIA PROJECTS.	23
CHAPTER 5.	BASIC COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM	28
CHAPTER 6.	CULTURAL ARTS PROGRAM	32
CHAPTER 7.	D. C. TEACHERS COLLEGE ORIENTATION PROGRAM.	36
CHAPTER 8.	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA YOUTH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA	40
CHAPTER 9.	GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ORIENTATION PROGRAM	45
CHAPTER 10.	GODDARD SPACE CENTER.	50
CHAPTER 11.	GONZAGA SUMMER SCHOOL HIGHER ACHIEVEMENT PROJECT.	53
CHAPTER 12.	LIBRARY	58
CHAPTER 13.	MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- BRUCE PROGRAM.	61

PAGE

CHAPTER 14. MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- H.D. COOKE PROGRAM 65

CHAPTER 15. MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- SEATON PROGRAM 68

CHAPTER 16. PRIMARY SUMMER SCHOOLS. 72

CHAPTER 17. PUPIL PERSONNEL -- CHILD AND YOUTH STUDY SUMMER PROGRAM 76

CHAPTER 18. PUPIL PERSONNEL -- SUMMER DROPOUT PROGRAM 79

CHAPTER 19. ST. ALBANS, INTERNATIONAL SEMINARS. 83

CHAPTER 20. SCIENCE -- INTRODUCTORY PHYSICAL SCIENCE. 86

CHAPTER 21. SCIENCE -- SCIENCE CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT STUDY 90

CHAPTER 22. SCIENCE -- TIME, SPACE, AND MATTER. 94

CHAPTER 23. SHARPE HEALTH SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED AND NON-HANDICAPPED STUDENTS. 98

CHAPTER 24. SMITHSONIAN ART WORKSHOP. 103

CHAPTER 25. SMITHSONIAN SUMMER PROGRAM. 107

CHAPTER 26. SMR EDUCATION 111

CHAPTER 27. SPECIAL EDUCATION 115

CHAPTER 28. SPEECH AND HEARING. 120

CHAPTER 29. STAY PROGRAM. 124

CHAPTER 30. SUMMER CAMPING. 128

CHAPTER 31. SUMMER LEARNING AND RECREATION PROGRAM. 132

CHAPTER 32. SUMMER MIDDLE SCHOOL, TRINITY COLLEGE 136

CHAPTER 33. SUMMER VOCATIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM 140

CHAPTER 34. THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY WORKSHOPS FOR CAREERS IN THE ARTS. 144

CHAPTER 35. URBAN COMMUNICATIONS AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY 149

CHAPTER 36. WEBSTER GIRLS' SCHOOL 154

CHAPTER 37. WIDENING HORIZONS 158

PAGE

PART THREE

AN OVERVIEW AND EVALUATION OF ALL THE SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

CHAPTER 38. OUTSTANDING PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND STRENGTHS 163

Voluntary Participation 163
Unique Learning Opportunities 163
Individual Attention. 164
Innovative Teaching, Staffing, and Community Involvement. . . . 164
Cultural Growth and the Prestige of Education 165
Jobs and the World of Work. 166
Enriching Academic Achievement. 166
Why These Programs Should Take Place in the Summer. 167

CHAPTER 39. PROGRAM LIMITATIONS AND PROBLEMS. 168

Waste 168
Responsibility. 168
Insufficient Funds. 170
Insufficient Time 170
Free Lunches and Transportation 171
Student Solicitors and "Begging". 171
Insufficient Recognition for Excellence 171
A Negative Learning Climate 172
Clerical Help 174
Reports 174
Follow-up and Liaison 176
Program Self-Evaluation 177

CHAPTER 40. EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS, RESEARCH AND INNOVATION 179

Illustration of an Exemplary Program. 179
Other Exemplary Programs. 180
Exemplary Aspects of Programs 182
Research and Innovation 183

CHAPTER 41. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS 185

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION

		PAGE
CHAPTER 1.	INTRODUCTION TO THIS REPORT	6
	Some Evaluation Considerations	7
	What to Evaluate	7
	Money Spent and Program Costs	8
	Better Cost Records	9
	Evaluation Planning Should Begin With Program Planning	9
CHAPTER 2.	PURPOSES OF THE 35 SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS	10

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THIS REPORT

This report will review and evaluate the 1970 Summer Enrichment Programs of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia. There were 35 such programs. Chapter Two alphabetically lists the summarized purposes of each program. In Part Two, each program is reviewed in a separate chapter with the following format:

A. Summary Data

1. Director of program
2. Location of program
3. Dates program began and ended
4. Numbers and types of staff and student participants
5. Cost in Summer Enrichment Program funds

B. Purpose of Program

C. Description of Program

1. Objectives
2. Procedures
3. Results

D. Evaluation

1. Major strengths
2. Limitations and problems encountered
3. Recommendations

Part Three will provide an overview and evaluation of all the programs. It has chapters which discuss the overall major accomplishments, strengths, limitations, and problems of the 35 programs in summer 1970. The next to last chapter discusses the most significant aspects of the Summer Enrichment Programs which might be considered for exploration, innovation, or incorporation into the regular year-round school system. The last chapter makes overall recommendations for future Summer Enrichment Programs.

Some Evaluation Considerations

It would be easy to document accomplishments of the 35 Summer Enrichment Programs by identifying what would not have taken place if there were no such programs. But a true enrichment program should be measured by more than its ability to profitably fill a time void. It would also be easy to justify the Summer Enrichment Programs on the basis that the $675,000 cost enabled millions of dollars worth of schools and other resources to be used which might otherwise have been unused during the summer. Or, the $675,000 could be divided by the number of pupils served and statistical findings, such as 100 dollars per pupil for some six week programs, or 12 dollars per pupil for other six week programs, might justify the programs. But even though all of the above justifications are valid, they would miss most of the true values of summer enrichment programs.

What to Evaluate

From the time that regular school ends in June, until it resumes in September, good summer programs should offer students those benefits that they most need and can receive from District of Columbia Public School resources. For some students in the enrichment programs of summer 1970, it was remedial or previously missed academic opportunities in one or more subject areas. For other students it was pre-college preparation without which they would not qualify for higher education. Many students wanted to use their summers to study what they could not study during the regular school year; special courses in the visual arts, theatre, dance, music, specific sciences, certain vocational skills, career explorations or advanced work in those subjects. A great many students desparately needed interesting recreational activities that could successfully compete with boredom. Metropolitan Washington is wealthy with cultural resources that were utilized to provide such activities. Many of the programs offered cultural enrichment that was also fun and attracted young people.

Also, a large number of students needed special services that could not wait until the summer was over. Disabled students needed special education to help reduce some of the educational handicaps caused by their disabilities. School-age pregnant girls were able to learn about proper infant care and continue working toward their high school diploma while awaiting and after the birth of their child. Dropouts and potential dropouts received vocational counseling and necessary assessment services in time to resume school in September. Some of the very poor and also not-so-poor students needed and obtained part-time or full-time jobs in order to be able to continue high school. Summer programs enabled some students to learn about a contemplated career, or explore a variety of possible careers, or even to earn money while learning from a skilled technician in an apprenticeship. Two week camping programs included academic instructions for part of each day while offering exquisite natural outdoor experiences

to poor children who would otherwise be bound to a hot dirty city. Neighborhood instructional programs also included afternoons of swimming and other sports or exciting field trips. Parents and community volunteers actively participated in, helped plan, contributed to, and learned from many of these programs.

Money Spent and Program Costs

The amount of money spent by the 35 Summer Enrichment Programs from appropriated District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program funds was $675,000. However, the full, complete, total costs of the 35 programs supported by these funds will never be known because most of them also used funds and resources from a variety of other sources. These other sources included funds from Title I, Impact Aid, the Model School Division, public and private agency grants, and individually solicited contributions and donations ranging from pennies to hundreds of dollars.

In some cases, parts or all of the programs were also a part of other multiply-funded programs from different District of Columbia or federal agencies. For example, summer enrichment funds paid $3,500 for buses to transport 38 students to the apprenticeship program at Goddard Space Center. But this was only one of many such apprenticeship programs which were not supported by summer enrichment funds; so, other sources paid the rest of the costs which included $1.40 per hour to the student apprentices for their full time eight week program. Additional examples of multiple funding would be the Model School Division Program at Seaton which also used Title I funds, the D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra Program which depended heavily upon funds solicited in the community by students and parents, and The George Washington University Workshops for Careers in the Arts which received additional funds from individuals and organizations. Materials and resources were loaned or given to some of the 35 programs because of the lateness of funding. In many of the 35 programs the director and/or some of the staff were assigned only part time and/or paid partly by summer enrichment funds and partly from other funds or agencies. In many cases persons volunteered their services fully; in some cases persons who were paid for other assignments gave part of that time to a Summer Enrichment Program. The 36 Summer Enrichment Program students in the St. Albans International Seminars shared their teachers (for very good program reasons) with 72 other students from private schools and other cities. The primary purposes of three of the programs were staff development of teachers, field testing of curricula and, in one case, the orientation of principals through the teaching of summer enrichment pupils (who received excellent science instructions). Many of the programs were located in area universities or other facilities which do not belong to the District of Columbia Public Schools. In such cases, summer enrichment funds did not pay for rent or supportive building services.

For all of the above reasons it would be more misleading than enlightening to divide the amount of Summer Enrichment Program funds spent by the number of students in each program. As a matter of fact the result

for some of the programs would be as ridiculously low as 83¢ in summer enrichment funds per student which, of course, would not include other kinds of funds spent for which no complete record exists.

But, it is correct to say that without the $675,000 most of these 35 programs would probably not have taken place, that the summer enrichment funds were essential to all the programs, and that more funds could probably have yielded even greater values.

If one would still insist upon a cost per student statement, the $675,000 divided by the 21,555 students in the 35 programs comes to approximately $31.31 of Summer Enrichment Program funds per student.

Better Cost Records

Although it is neither within the scope nor role of this evaluation report to make recommendations that do not pertain directly to Summer Enrichment Programs, it would seem very worthwhile to identify and record the funding, from all sources, which support programs that receive any funds from District of Columbia Public Schools in the future.

It is very definitely within the scope and role of this report to recommend that students enrolled in District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Programs in 1971 should not have to spend considerable portions of their learning or fun time in "soliciting" or -- to use a less pleasant but equally accurate word -- "begging" for money to help finance their programs. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 39 on "Program Limitations and Problems".

Evaluation Planning Should Begin With Program Planning

Evaluation planning should begin with program planning. Evaluation planning for the 1970 Summer Enrichment Programs did not begin until all 35 programs were funded and under way. This precluded before and after assessments of pupil achievement levels, test score gains, controlled program studies, and valid monitoring. Consequently this evaluation report is based upon site visits, interviews, and studies of programs that were nearly over or already completed.

Some of the evaluative recommendations in this report could have been considered for implementation immediately instead of having to wait until summer 1971 -- for example, for many programs, to keep records of remedial academic achievements and successful strategies that could be sent to the fall semester teachers of summer remedial pupils; or, for one program, to pre- and post-test in both arithmetic and reading instead of pre-testing in arithmetic and post-testing in reading. It is strongly recommended that evaluation planning should begin in February, or March at the latest, for the 1971 Summer Enrichment Programs. This will be discussed more fully in later chapters.

CHAPTER 2

PURPOSES OF THE 35 SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

Following are the primary and basic purposes of the thirty-five 1970 Summer Enrichment Programs of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia. They provide a brief overview of the enrichment program objectives. However, the nature and accomplishments of these programs cannot really be summarized because of their individuality. Accordingly, each program is reviewed and evaluated in detail, in Part Two of this report, beginning with Chapter Three.

* * * * * * *

Chapter 3: "African Studies"

The purpose of this project was to make available to each student an examination of the historical accomplishments of Black peoples throughout the world and especially in Africa. Materials consisted of information regarding all areas (including art, music, science, and politics) of Black endeavors and how these relate to the world community. Swahili was studied as an integral part of the program.

Chapter 4: "Anacostia Projects"

The purpose was to up-grade the reading abilities and interest of 750 elementary school children in the project through an inquiry learning environment; also, to provide on-going skill training for Community Reading Assistants acting as project para-professionals.

Chapter 5: "Basic Community School Program"

To provide an interesting summer school program with enriching academic as well as recreational values; also, to actively involve the parents and community in this program.

Chapter 6: "Cultural Arts Program"

To offer a variety of structured and improvised experiences in the Arts (music, visual arts, dance, theatre arts, literature, and creative writing) for the purposes of developing creativity in interested students, of furthering students' performing opportunities in the various disciplines, and to offer opportunities for general enrichment of the regular school curriculum.

Chapter 7: "D.C. Teachers College Orientation Program"

To help students with interest and potential for college to develop needed academic skills in mathematics, reading, verbal expression, and study methods.

Chapter 8: "District of Columbia Youth Symphony Orchestra"

To provide six summer weeks of music instructions, performance, and appreciation for District of Columbia Public School students in grades two through twelve. Also, to rehearse and prepare the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra to represent the United States in Switzerland; to provide a large instrumental music learning center for teachers; and to make available summer employment opportunities for Student Aides.

Chapter 9: "Georgetown University College Orientation Program"

The purpose of the program was twofold. First, to identify students who had the intellectual potential requisite for success in college, but who, for a variety of reasons, had not performed satisfactorily in high school; and second, to acquaint these students with selected aspects of college life which could contribute to their success after admission.

Chapter 10: "Goddard Space Center"

This summer incentive project taught trade skills, such as welding, provided science laboratory learning experiences, and offered preparation for part-time employment and scholarships.

Chapter 11: "Gonzaga Summer School Higher Achieveme . Project"

The purpose of this project was to help students, from low income families, who had good academic potential but low achievement develop their maximum level of performance by providing them with instructions as well as enrichment and motivational activities. The students were encouraged to consider college and given college preparatory work.

Chapter 12: "Library"

To support the on-going summer school teaching programs at four participating schools and to provide library books that neighborhood children could take home.

Chapter 13: "Model School Division -- Bruce Program"

To provide cultural enrichment for children in the Bruce School community during the summer and to give student and parent participants a voice in planning and implementing the program.

Chapter 14: "Model School Division -- H. D. Cooke Program"

To provide enriching summer recreation program activities for elementary school children in the H. D. Cooke school neighborhood.

Chapter 15: "Model School Division -- Seaton Program"

To provide learning experiences for children in the areas of reading, science, mathematics, social studies, instrumental and vocal music, theatre arts, dance, and esthetics.

Chapter 16: "Primary Summer Schools"

The major purpose of the Primary Summer Schools was to teach reading skills. Coupled with this was the aim to provide experiences which would motivate children to express their own ideas about the things they know, thereby improving their verbal communications and reading comprehension.

Chapter 17: "Pupil Personnel -- Child and Youth Study Summer Program"

To provide individual assessment and evaluation services for students during the summer. The findings and recommendations of these services should be available to the respective schools before classes begin in September.

Chapter 18: "Pupil Personnel -- Summer Dropout Program"

To help dropouts from District of Columbia Public Schools, age 16 and over, to return to school or vocational services.

Chapter 19: "St. Albans, International Seminars"

The primary purpose of the program was to provide secondary school students with an intellectually stimulating experience in international studies. Its secondary purpose was to bring together as heterogeneous a group of students and school backgrounds as possible.

Chapter 20: "Science -- Introductory Physical Science"

To train District of Columbia junior high school teachers in the use of innovative and modern science programs. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science subject content, and to understand the developmental psychology aspects of teaching and learning science. Concurrently, to assist interested students in learning more about the sciences.

Chapter 21: "Science -- Science Curriculum Improvement Study"

To train District of Columbia elementary school teachers in the use of innovative and modern science programs. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science subject content, and to understand the developmental psychology aspects of teaching and learning science. Concurrently, to assist interested elementary school students in learning more about the sciences.

Chapter 22: "Science -- Time, Space, and Matter"

To prepare District of Columbia junior high school teachers in the use of an innovative and modern science curriculum. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science subject content, and to understand the developmental psychology aspects of teaching and learning science. Concurrently, to assist interested junior high school students in learning more about the earth sciences.

Chapter 23: "Sharpe Health School Program for Handicapped and Non-Handicapped Students"

To provide "language experiences in reading" for physically disabled and non-disabled students to enrich their reading, comprehension, vocabulary, written and oral skills, and thought organization abilities. Also, to increase "child-initiated" interaction between disabled and non-disabled children.

Chapter 24: "Smithsonian Art Workshop"

The Summer Art Workshop held at the Smithsonian Institute was a six-week program designed to give talented students special training in the use of art media. It was also designed to provide experiences in viewing the works of outstanding artists of past centuries as well as contemporary ones.

Chapter 25: "Smithsonian Summer Program"

Smithsonian Institution resources provided information and education in the natural sciences and history, with related public speaking opportunities, for junior and senior high school students from District of Columbia high schools. These students had opportunities to help guide and instruct inner-city pupils and other visitors through the exhibits.

Chapter 26: "SMR Education"

To provide a summer enrichment program for Severely Mentally Retarded pupils in academic, social, and recreational activities. Physical development was included.

Chapter 27: "Special Education"

To provide visually impaired students with instructions in academic skills: in communications (Braille, large-print, recording), reading, and arithmetic; to provide field trips for cultural and educational experiences; to provide a comprehensive physical education and recreational program; and to provide certain ophthalmological evaluations as needed.

Chapter 28: "Speech and Hearing"

The purpose of these clinics is to provide continuing therapy services for students referred by speech correctionists or hearing therapists, for students attending the regular summer school program who have been screened and found defective by a correctionist, and for students referred by principals or professionals in allied agencies.

Chapter 29: "STAY Program"

To provide part-time placement services for jobs during the school year, for students, of ages 16 to 21, to help them earn enough to continue school to graduation. These jobs were selected to also prepare the student for full-time employment after graduation. Also, to plan follow-up survey studies of participants in the program.

Chapter 30: "Summer Camping"

The purpose was to enrich and enhance the educational experiences of pupils through the use of the resources of a natural environment utilizing actual experiences as available only in a camp setting. Also to provide opportunities for individual growth and development in a situation which promoted a total environmental philosophy relating man's human resources to his natural resources.

Chapter 31: "Summer Learning and Recreation Program"

To provide a summer program of academic instructions and recreational activities, for elementary and junior high school students, with special emphasis on reading, self expression, and the development of interest in academic education.

Chapter 32: "Summer Middle School, Trinity College"

The purpose of this project was to bring students, in grades five through twelve, and with varying backgrounds and talents, together and to provide them with concentrated academic activities.

Chapter 33: "Summer Vocational Orientation Program"

The purpose of this project was to introduce students in the District of Columbia, particularly those who were not college bound, to the world of work and the possibilities of gainful employment.

Chapter 34: "The George Washington University Workshops for Careers in the Arts

The primary purpose of the program was to provide talented public school students with skill, training, and exposure to the "Arts", particularly those students who because of limited economic resources were unable to gain meaningful training and other experiences on their own.

Chapter 35: "Urban Communications at American University"

To provide learning and experience opportunities for students in the fields of journalism and broadcasting with opportunities to demonstrate their skills and talents and continue their training in these fields.

Chapter 36: "Webster Girls' School"

This program was designed to enable pregnant school-age girls to continue their education while awaiting delivery of their child and to encourage them to complete their high school education after the birth of the child.

Chapter 37: "Widening Horizons"

The purpose of this project was to provide cultural stimulation for inner-city children through field trips and, especially, to provide them with curriculum enrichment and practical vocational experiences.

PART TWO

A REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF EACH 1970 SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

		PAGE
CHAPTER 3.	AFRICAN STUDIES.	19
CHAPTER 4.	ANACOSTIA PROJECTS	23
CHAPTER 5.	BASIC COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM	28
CHAPTER 6.	CULTURAL ARTS PROGRAM.	32
CHAPTER 7.	D.C. TEACHERS COLLEGE ORIENTATION PROGRAM.	36
CHAPTER 8.	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA YOUTH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA.	40
CHAPTER 9.	GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ORIENTATION PROGRAM.	45
CHAPTER 10.	GODDARD SPACE CENTER	50
CHAPTER 11.	GONZAGA SUMMER SCHOOL HIGHER ACHIEVEMENT PROJECT	53
CHAPTER 12.	LIBRARY.	58
CHAPTER 13.	MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- BRUCE PROGRAM	61
CHAPTER 14.	MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- H.D. COOKE PROGRAM.	65
CHAPTER 15.	MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- SEATON PROGRAM.	68
CHAPTER 16.	PRIMARY SUMMER SCHOOLS	72
CHAPTER 17.	PUPIL PERSONNEL -- CHILD AND YOUTH STUDY SUMMER PROGRAM. . . .	76
CHAPTER 18.	PUPIL PERSONNEL -- SUMMER DROPOUT PROGRAM	79
CHAPTER 19.	ST. ALBANS, INTERNATIONAL SEMINARS	83
CHAPTER 20.	SCIENCE -- INTRODUCTORY PHYSICAL SCIENCE	86
CHAPTER 21.	SCIENCE -- SCIENCE CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT STUDY.	90
CHAPTER 22.	SCIENCE -- TIME, SPACE, AND MATTER	94

PAGE

CHAPTER 23. SHARPE HEALTH SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED AND NON-HANDICAPPED STUDENTS 98

CHAPTER 24. SMITHSONIAN ART WORKSHOP 103

CHAPTER 25. SMITHSONIAN SUMMER PROGRAM 107

CHAPTER 26. SMR EDUCATION. 111

CHAPTER 27. SPECIAL EDUCATION. 115

CHAPTER 28. SPEECH AND HEARING 120

CHAPTER 29. STAY PROGRAM 124

CHAPTER 30. SUMMER CAMPING 128

CHAPTER 31. SUMMER LEARNING AND RECREATION PROGRAM 132

CHAPTER 32. SUMMER MIDDLE SCHOOL, TRINITY COLLEGE. 136

CHAPTER 33. SUMMER VOCATIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM. 140

CHAPTER 34. THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY WORKSHOPS FOR CAREERS IN THE ARTS 144

CHAPTER 35. URBAN COMMUNICATIONS AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY. 149

CHAPTER 36. WEBSTER GIRLS' SCHOOL. 154

CHAPTER 37. WIDENING HORIZONS. 158

CHAPTER 3

AFRICAN STUDIES

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Dr. Joseph Applegate

2. Location of Project: Howard University

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

15 Students, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior High School Students
1 Coordinator
1 Instructor in Swahili and African Studies
2 Assistant Instructors

5. Cost: $3,990 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project was to make available to each student an examination of the historical accomplishments of Black peoples throughout the world and especially in Africa. Materials consisted of information regarding all areas (including art, music, science, and politics) of Black endeavors and how these relate to the world community. Swahili was studied as an integral part of the program.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To help Black students expand their values and gain a sense of

pride through examinations of the many contributions made by Black peoples throughout history.

b. To enlighten Black students regarding the creative and scientific tools that are needed in a productive society.

c. To increase student interest in learning through the introduction of studies they consider relevant to them and with which they can identify.

d. To determine the degree of student interest in Swahili and African history.

2. Procedures

This project was designed to provide an in-depth study of Black cultures by examining the earliest concepts of community living in Black African culture as well as throughout the world. Students in the project learned about the contributions of Black people in various fields throughout history.

The program attempted to motivate students to develop reading and writing skills by relating relevant materials to Black history. Also, an attempt was made to give students a better understanding of today's world as a result of selected experiences in the program.

An announcement of this program in the regular high schools brought 40 requests for participation. Because of limited funds, and the expansion of the 1970 summer program, only 15 students could be accepted. The other 25 who expressed an interest could not be accepted because of lacking funds. The 15 students were selected at their schools on the basis of their strong interest. Some of the 25 unaccepted students took other summer programs. Academic credits earned in the program were applied to those required for graduation from the regular school.

Swahili was treated as an introductory course which covered the basic structural patterns of the language and developed the student's ability to converse in Swahili using a limited vocabulary.

Resource people from Howard University visited some of the classes as speakers and discussed the role of the Black man in past and recent history. Students were taken on field trips to selected places, including the embassies of several African countries, the Museum of African Art, and other places of interest dealing with Black history and culture. Student interest was increased by relating experiences gained from field trips to films, slides and discussions. Students had many opportunities to express their experiences creatively through written and oral reports.

The staff included one instructor for Swahili and African history chosen from the advanced graduate student program in African Studies and Research at Howard University. There were also two assistant instructors, graduate students from Howard University.

In the 1970 program, students were able to use the language laboratory facilities at Howard University. All 15 students received stipends of $1.60 per hour for their participation. They also received free lunches and transportation. This enabled poor students to participate who would otherwise have had to work during the summer.

The project staff evaluated students' understanding and interpretation of the language and subject matter content. This was often done through discussion, written reports and creative activities. Evaluation services were provided by the Department of African Studies and Research at Howard University. Special consultation services and supervision of the program were provided by two senior linguists, also of the African Studies and Research program at Howard University.

3. Results

a. All 15 students completed the program with over 95 percent daily attendance.

b. All 15 students received one-half of a high school credit in Swahili language.

c. Students increased their reading, especially of materials related to African Studies. The director felt that this would carry over with increased interest in reading in other subject areas during the coming school year.

d. The students all indicated that they had gained new educational interests as well as knowledge. They requested that similar African language and culture courses be conducted during the regular school year on Saturdays at Howard University.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Students received unique opportunities to learn Swahili and African culture, history, and arts in a university setting.

b. Classes were small enough to enable individual and intensive instructions; i.e. one instructor plus two assistant instructors for 15 students.

c. The program was supplemented with pertinent field visits and outside speakers.

d. Materials and resources included both contemporary and historical aspects of African culture.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Because of lacking funds, only 15 of the 40 student applicants could be accepted into this program.

b. Many of the regular high school teachers indicated that they saw only minimal academic values in studies of Swahili.

c. Funding was not approved until the end of May. This did not permit adequate planning time.

3. Recommendations

a. There should be adequate funding to accommodate all students with the interests and qualifications to take this program in summer 1971. It can be assumed that this will include at least twice as many students as in summer 1970 since an increased number of students are taking Swahili in the regular 1970 school year.

b. However, it would seem that a staff of three instructors, plus the many voluntary outside speakers, could accommodate and adequately instruct more than 15 students. Planning for summer 1971 should consider whether one qualified instructor plus two qualified assistant instructors can adequately include 30 students in the program. If not, the reasons should be specified when asking for additional funds.

c. The language should not be separated from the history and culture. It should be included as it was this year. However, other African language possibilities might also be considered, e.g. Zulu, in a survey approach.

CHAPTER 4

ANACOSTIA PROJECTS

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Merca Toole

2. Location of Project: Congress Heights, Draper, Green, McGogney, and Savoy Elementary Schools.

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

750 Students, in Kindergarten thru Grade 6, from eight Elementary Schools in the Anacostia area.
1 Director
2 Coordinators
2 Video Team Instructors in television teaching techniques
1 Photography Specialist
5 Team Leaders
25 Teachers
5 Librarians
105 Community Reading Assistants
50 Student Aides (paid "Work Scholarship Students" from District of Columbia Junior and Senior High Schools.)

5. Cost: $61,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose was to up-grade the reading abilities and interest of 750 elementary school children in the project through an inquiry learning environment; also, to provide on-going skill training for Community Reading Assistants acting as project para-professionals.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

The program had two major objectives:

a. To upgrade the reading abilities and interest of 750 elementary school students in the project through an inquiry learning environment.

b. To provide on-going skill training for Community Reading Assistants who were project para-professionals.

2. Procedures

The program operated four hours daily, from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., under the direction of a coordinator (an Anacostia Community School Team Member) whose responsibility was to oversee the daily program operations and to maintain the necessary project records.

Seven hundred and fifty students were selected for the program on the basis of their interest and the recommendation of their regular teacher. Special consideration was given to students who seemed to need such program activities for the summer. But this was not a requirement. Students generally walked to the program from home. Free lunches were available for all students.

In each of the Centers, five teams, each composed of one teacher, four Community Reading Assistants, and two "Student Aides", who were paid "Work Scholarship Students" from District of Columbia Junior and Senior High Schools, conducted "Inquiry Learning Centers".

The themes for the Centers were:

a. "The World of Art and Photography" -- This included the taking and developing of photographs and the relationships of photography and the other visual arts.

b. "Science Comes Alive" -- This included live animal and other demonstration exhibits related to the sciences. For example, children saw the birth and development of white mice.

c. "Our Number Nook" -- Concepts and the practical uses of numbers and mathematics were taught in relation to daily living; e.g., how to read an electric meter, the number of watts on a light bulb, and the payment of household bills.

d. "Hooked on Books" (and Language Arts) -- Books were used to increase verbal and communicative skills and creative self-expression.

e. "Make, Taste, and Do Center (Sewing, Cooking, Woodcraft) -- Students were taught skills for household use and fun; for example, how to make a bulletin board out of popcorn balls.

There were also related field trips to area resources, such as museums, science exhibits, and local farms. Free transportation was provided.

Centers were organized so that 30 children worked in each center for 40 minutes. Then, the groups separated and formed new classes of 30 students each. This occurred five times daily on a rotation basis. The system enabled each student to meet with 20 community residents and five teachers daily. Furthermore, it enabled the children to meet with each other in experience-learning situations.

Since it was expected that the student composition would be divided between half primary and half intermediate levels, programming provided a family type of life style in each center wherein youths of various ages might learn from one another.

The Anacostia Innovation Team developed 30 suggested curriculum packets for each Center. These contained activities that could be coordinated into worthwhile learning experiences so that, daily, all five Centers might present interrelated activities.

The Anacostia Innovation Team Members had the responsibility of upgrading the skills of the Community Reading Assistants and the teachers. The staff included selected Anacostia teachers who understood the Anacostia Project program philosophy and were able to work effectively with Community Reading Assistants. The 105 Community Reading Assistants supplemented the teams at a ratio of four Community Reading Assistants to each teacher.

The 105 Community Reading Assistants and the 25 teachers received an intensive "minicourse" in the effective use of television resources for teaching. The course was taught by two specialist instructors. The Community Reading Assistants also worked on individual projects to increase their knowledge of library skills, teaching methods, and independent study. Since the "minicourse" continued, in various schools, for four hours daily during the entire time of the six week program, the Community Reading Assistants had opportunities to utilize their new skills daily with the summer program students.

3. Results

a. At least 700 of the students completed the program with good attendance.

b. The teachers felt that all students who completed the program made gains in academic skills as well as increased interest in learning.

c. The 105 Community Reading Assistants gained new library abilities, teaching skills, and had experience teaching opportunities.

d. The low number of pupils per instructor permitted considerable individual attention. However, no tests or assessment records were kept and no reports were sent to the regular schools.

e. Students had an opportunity to experience, generally for the first time, interesting educational resources in the area.

f. The Community Reading Assistants are scheduled to continue their work with students in the Anacostia area during the 1970-71 school year, employed at GS-3 and -4 levels. All felt that their summer training and teaching experiences would help greatly during the coming school year.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This program offered good quality experience learning opportunities for 700 students and 105 para-professional teachers.

b. The low number of pupils per instructor permitted individual and special attention to students beyond what is normally available during the school year.

c. Community and city learning resources were utilized to strengthen the program.

d. Students seemed to gain academically as well as in educational interest.

e. The 105 Community Reading Assistants said that they would do a better job as teaching para-professionals during the coming school year as a result of this program.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

It was not known how much money the program would actually have until May 1970. This was too late to order supplies for arrival before the program began. Consequently the supplies drifted in all summer.

3. Recommendations

a. Funding should come early enough to enable ordered supplies to arrive early enough.

b. There should be consideration for forwarding, at least pertinent, records of students' achievements, special needs, and instructional approaches which seemed to work well, to the regular schools in time to be considered by the regular teacher of each pupil in September. This might require an additional staff member but could well be worth the extra cost if it provided valuable pupil information.

c. Follow-up studies of the successes and problems of the 105 paraprofessionals, during their teaching year following the summer program, could yield valuable information for staff development and future program planning.

CHAPTER 5

BASIC COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mr. Fred J. Aranha

2. Location of Project: Beers, Emery, Maury, and Richardson Elementary Schools and Johnson and Paul Junior High Schools.

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: August 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants

1,153 Students from Beers, Emery, Maury, and Richardson Elementary Schools
402 Students from Johnson and Paul Junior High Schools
6 Coordinators
22 Elementary School Teachers
13 Junior High School Teachers
6 Parent Aides
25 Student Neighborhood Youth Corps Workers

5. Cost: $25,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide an interesting summer school program with enriching academic as well as recreational values; also, to actively involve the parents and community in this program.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide an interesting and enriching summer program for students

who, generally, would otherwise have had no summer program.

b. To provide remedial as well as academic instructions in an informal classroom atmosphere.

c. To combine the educational and recreational aspects of classroom and field trip activities.

d. To invite parents and the community to actively participate in the program.

e. To make good use of educational resources, in the Washington Metropolitan area, for field trips.

2. Procedures

The program was announced in the schools, in flyers sent to the homes via pupils, and in the neighborhoods. There were no eligibility requirements. One thousand five hundred and fifty-five students applied and were accepted. The program was daily from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and sometimes on Saturday. Free lunches were provided in some of the schools.

Students had scheduled classes in mathematics, reading, current events, music, art, crafts, cooking, sewing, and "Black drama" (i.e. plays by Black writers). Students in need of remedial reading, as identified by their regular schools or diagnostic tests, received remedial reading instructions. There were also various indoor and outdoor sports activity programs. Field trips included visits to such places as the Wax Museum, Trolley Museum, Cabin John, Smithsonian Museum, the White House, Harpers Ferry, and the Beltsville Agriculture Extension Center.

The classes were taught by 35 regular school teachers assisted by six parents and 25 Neighborhood Youth Corps workers. The same staff also accompanied the 1,555 students on their field trips to make the trips maximally educational as well as interesting. In this way, students could relate their field trip experiences to their classroom instructions; for example, expressing themselves in writing, speech, and through art and drama.

The staff in each school tried to identify individual pupil needs that could be helped during the summer program. This included such help as remedial work in reading or mathematics, individual attention and instructions in art and music, and the encouragement of self-confidence and self expression for some students. In some of the schools, and for some of the field trips, neighborhood parents volunteered their services where needed.

Records of attendance and other needed information were kept only for the on-going program. The teachers also recorded the achievements of the students in the remedial programs. However no formal individual pupil records were sent to the regular schools of the pupils.

3. Results

a. One thousand five hundred and fifty-five students attended an enriching summer program with academic as well as recreational activities. The director said that the approximate average daily attendance was 95 percent.

b. The teachers indicated that the students seemed to make good use of their field trip experiences for academic as well as cultural and personal growth.

c. There was considerable parent and community interest and participation with individuals volunteering to help with classes, field trips, and scheduling.

d. The six parent aides became, in fact, instructional para-professionals for the program.

e. The 25 Neighborhood Youth Corps Aides, in addition to providing good services to the program, seemed to gain personally in terms of maturity, experience, responsibility, and clerical skills.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. The students received an interesting and enriching summer program which combined and related educational, instructional, and recreational activities.

b. Good quality parent and community involvement were reported.

c. Area community resources were well utilized for educational field trips.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Funding approval and the amount of funds were not known until July 1st. This was too late for adequate program planning, staff selection, and staff preparation.

b. Many of the supplies could not be ordered until the last minute because of the late funding.

c. Teachers felt that many of the students at the schools which did not provide free lunches needed the lunches.

3. Recommendations

a. Funding should come early enough to enable adequate program planning, staffing, staff preparation, and the ordering of supplies. This would have to be before the end of May at the latest. Early funding would also enable time for better student recruitment and parent and community involvement.

b. Free lunches should be provided for all participating students, in the 1971 summer program, even though they attend for only half a day.

c. Records of all students receiving remedial instructions should be sent to their regular schools in time to be utilized by their respective regular teachers in September. Remedial accomplishments and successful strategies should be included.

CHAPTER 6

CULTURAL ARTS PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Directors: Miss Barbara White, Mrs. Amy Green

2. Location of Project: Backus, Macfarland, and Sousa Junior High Schools.

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: August 14, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

1,027 Students, in 3rd through 10th grades, from District of Columbia Public Schools
2 Coordinators
20 Teachers
30 Neighborhood Youth Corps Teacher Aides
1 Secretary

5. Cost: $30,200 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To offer a variety of structured and improvised experiences in the Arts (music, visual arts, dance, theatre arts, literature, and creative writing) for the purposes of developing creativity in interested students, of furthering students' performing opportunities in the various disciplines, and to offer opportunities for general enrichment of the regular school curriculum.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To group the art courses in a cluster so that learnings which

students derive from one discipline might increase and reinforce learnings from other disciplines.

b. To provide a variety of experiences for fostering creative thinking in students.

c. To exhibit at the end of an eight week session the various theatre components which go to make up a play and which involved all the arts.

2. Procedures

The program was announced in June at all District of Columbia Public Schools. The only requirements for participation were to be a student within the age range of five through 18, to be interested, and, for instrumental students, to have completed at least one year of instrumental music. Students met daily from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Free hot lunches were served. Students provided their own transportation to get to the program.

Courses were provided for the students in instrumental and vocal music, the visual arts, dance, theatre arts, literature, and creative writing. In addition, field trips included visits to Shady Grove, area museums, exhibits of African Arts, and a picnic. Bus transportation was provided for the field trips.

Thirty Neighborhood Youth Corps Teacher Aides supplemented the twenty classroom teachers who were all specialists in the arts. The program had the following five courses:

a. Music -- vocal, instrumental, and ensemble practice (no theory or composition).

b. Visual Arts -- all fine art forms.

c. Theatre Arts -- pantomime, improvised plays and sets.

d. Dance -- for boys and girls; modern, movement forms, and expressive styles.

e. Creative Writing -- students wrote poetry, stories, and vignettes of personal experiences.

Students were permitted to select any two of the five art courses. Therefore a unified or multi-arts approach, and the objective of cluster or reinforced learnings among the disciplines, could not expand beyond two art forms because of the lack of time. This lack of time was not the number of weeks of program duration, but rather the fact that the program lasted only a half day instead of a full day. Many students wanted to work a full day, and many teachers wanted to work with them, but there were no funds to pay the teachers for the other half day. Some of the teachers volunteered some

extra half days without pay; but this did not really solve the problem. This time shortage reduced not only the number of art forms possible for students, but also limited the intensiveness of their studies.

No formal tests or measurements were used and no reports were sent to students' regular schools. There was also no formal carry-over or tie-in with the regular school program through the academic school vear.

3. Results

a. Nine hundred twenty-seven of the 1,027 students completed the program. Teachers indicated that there was excellent interest and morale, no discipline problems, no equipment (e.g. expensive music instruments) breakage, and all instruments were returned.

b. All students seemed to gain in subject skills and abilities for self expression through the arts.

c. Approximately 75 percent of the students who completed the program expressed an interest in continuing their education in the arts.

d. Students interested in one art form learned to appreciate and utilize the other art form. (Students were limited to two art forms.)

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Nine hundred twenty-seven successfully completed their arts program.

b. There were definite gains in students' understanding of the arts and skills with the arts.

c. Students demonstrated greater and new abilities to express themselves through the arts. Students demonstrated creativity in improvisation, especially in theatre.

d. There was a very good quality of interpersonal relationships among students and with teachers as well as towards the educational situation. Students frequently tried to help each other with their work.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. The program was too short, i.e. not enough hours per day, to include more than two art forms.

b. Because funds could not be used until June 29, there was insufficient time for program planning, staff selection, and to obtain equipment.

c. The Neighborhood Youth Corps Teacher Aides (paid by the Dept. of HEW) did not have adequate orientation and preparation for their jobs because of insufficient time before the program began.

d. There was a shortage of clerical help for records, liaison, answering telephone calls, etc.

3. Recommendations

a. This seems like a fine quality and much needed program. However, the program objectives were only partially fulfilled because students could only select two art forms due to the limited program time. Two five-week sections should be considered for next year's program, or longer hours per day, preferably both, to enable students to study more than two art forms.

b. As an alternative to the above recommendation, a multi-arts curriculum might be considered which would teach all the art forms to all the students, during the available time, with emphasis on one area possible. This approach could also be combined with the recommendation for longer days and/or longer duration of program.

c. The program should be completely approved and funded by April for maximally effective planning, staffing, and staff orientation.

d. Fifty-two program staff members and 1,027 students certainly need more than one secretary for supportive clerical services.

e. There should be a multi-arts staff development program to prepare arts specialist teachers to relate to all of the arts in their teaching.

CHAPTER 7

D. C. TEACHERS COLLEGE ORIENTATION PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Dr. Charles Walker Thomas

2. Location of Project: D. C. Teachers College

3. Date Begun: June 15, 1970 Date Completed: July 17, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

84 Students (35 high school graduates, 31 from 11th grade, 18 from 10th grade)
1 Director
7 Teachers

5. Cost: $12,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To help students with interest and potential for college to develop needed academic skills in mathematics, reading, verbal expression, and study methods.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide a college preparatory program with intensive academic instructions in mathematics, reading, verbal expression and study skills.

b. To prepare the 10th and 11th grade students to meet college admission requirements.

c. To prepare the high school graduates to do college level work.

d. Tenth and 11th grade high school students were assisted with $1.60 per hour stipends to stimulate interest and meet financial needs. Thirty-five high school graduates received no stipends.

2. Procedures

a. Students were recommended by their school counselors and principals. There were no other eligibility requirements. Local schools selected students who were potential candidates for college who seemed to need academic help for admission or to do college work.

b. Students currently in high school were paid $1.60 per hour for the period of approximately four hours tuition daily. High school graduates were not paid. It was entirely voluntary for all.

c. All students received intensive academic instructions in mathematics, reading, verbal expression, and study skills.

d. Remedial and individual development methods were used as needed. Classes were small and individual attention was available for special needs of students.

e. The program included a Reading Laboratory with dictating and other machines to develop word and communications skills.

f. Mathematics instructions included college entrance levels through first year college math.

3. Results

a. Seventy-nine of the 84 students successfully (i.e. with individual academic gains) completed the program.

b. In mathematics and reading, all students made grade level improvements, especially those students who entered with serious academic deficits. (However, this was not quantified.)

c. The 35 high school graduates were tested in mathematics and verbal abilities before and after the program, on the "Cooperative School and College Abilities Test". All showed some improvement in both subject areas. Reports on this before and after testing were sent to the college admissions office. All 35 students who had graduated high school were accepted for college to begin in September 1970.

d. Reports on the academic achievements and needs of the 49 high school students were not sent to the respective high schools but were made available if requested.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. High quality instructions in small classes. The teachers were from D. C. Teachers College or otherwise specially selected to teach college level work.

b. All of the 35 high school graduates were accepted by colleges for September.

c. The high school students all made grade level quality gains in every subject.

d. Very high enthusiasm, morale, and excellent attendance which seemed only partially dependent upon the dollar payments; e.g. graduates were not paid and attended as regularly as the others who were paid; also some high school students took an extra course without pay.

e. Students learned to recognize their academic problems and to seek help from their teachers.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Textbooks and workbooks did not come until one or two weeks after the courses began even though they were ordered a week before the courses began.

b. Better and wider range workbooks would have been more desirable than the ones provided. This should have been planned earlier with appropriate consultation.

c. Classes included some students who were way behind the others and some who were relatively quite advanced in the subjects. There were not enough teachers to divide the classes in each subject into groups with similar abilities.

3. Recommendations

a. This seems like a high quality academic program, much needed by many District students, that can make a significant difference in their chances for acceptance and success in college. However, additional time, resources, and especially liaison with the regular high schools seem necessary for maximal program effectiveness.

b. All high school students should be tested before and after taking the college preparation program not only for achievement record purposes but especially so that their regular school teachers, in September, would know about their accomplishments, problems, and ways in which to help with problems. Sending no reports limited the values of their achievements.

c. Sending reports to the colleges to be attended by the 35 graduates seemed valuable and should be continued in future programs.

d. The idea of $1.60 per hour seemed like a good idea for the high school students. However, the director of the program did not think the graduates should also be paid. He thought it should continue like it was.

e. There should be a closer liaison between this program and <u>each</u> student's regular high school teacher to enable the regular teacher to build on the student's gains from the program.

f. Follow-up information about the academic success of the 35 students accepted at colleges would assist in planning for next year's program.

g. The program should be six weeks and should coincide with the other summer enrichment programs.

h. There was too large a range of student abilities in each subject. This was <u>not</u> necessarily due to age or grade level. Additional teachers would enable ability grouping for more effective teaching.

i. There should be earlier and better referral of students, especially college bound high school seniors who need pre-college academic help. Presently D. C. Teachers College is the only college that makes such referrals. Direct referrals by other area colleges might be considered.

CHAPTER 8

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA YOUTH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mr. Lyn McLain

2. Location of Project: Coolidge High School and Whittier Elementary

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

1,139 Students, ages 7-18, in 2nd thru 12th grade
1 Director
44 Teachers
1 Adult Aide
1 Administrative Aide
18 Student Aides

5. Cost: $22,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide six summer weeks of music instructions, performance, and appreciation for District of Columbia Public School students in grades two through twelve. Also, to rehearse and prepare the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra to represent the United States in Switzerland; to provide a large instrumental music learning center for teachers; and to make available summer employment opportunities for Student Aides.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide 1,139 District of Columbia Public School students with a broad summer program of good quality music instructions and performance opportunities.

b. To provide the District of Columbia Youth Symphony Orchestra with professional quality instructions, rehearsals, and preparation for their itinerary, representing the United States at the International Festival of Youth Orchestras in St. Moritz, Switzerland, during August 1970.

c. To provide advanced music students opportunities for relevant summer employment.

2. Procedures

a. This program met daily from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

b. It offered a six week summer schedule of professional music instructions to students from all District of Columbia Public Schools. Approximately three-fourths of the applicants were accepted on the basis of their interest in music and serious intent to study. There were no specific talent requirements for applicants, only their interest in learning music.

c. The 1,139 students were given their choice of instrument instructions and offered ensemble training, theory, and ensemble playing.

d. There were beginning classes for seven to eight year old students.

e. The students were instructed by 44 professional musician-teachers. Because of the large number of scheduled students, it cost only 42¢ per student-hour of instructions even though these teachers are normally paid $10 per lesson.

f. Eighteen members of the District of Columbia Youth Symphony Orchestra worked as paid Student Aides who assisted with the program. They gave out instruments, kept records, helped students find their classes, acted as assistants to the teacher and, in a few cases, taught whole classes.

g. One hundred thirty of the participants were advanced music students in the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra and were provided with advanced professional instructions. They rehearsed right up to the last day and gave a public concert at Watergate before leaving to represent the United States at the International Festival of Youth Orchestras in St. Moritz, Switzerland.

h. While in Switzerland the 130 students met with nine other student orchestras from eight countries. They performed together and competed for three scholarships to study in Europe for a year and to play in the International Orchestra. While in Europe, they visited Swiss towns and enjoyed many music and other cultural attractions.

i. During the year, the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra will meet twice weekly to continue their studies.

j. Since insufficient funds did not even enable adequate administrative records, no formal socio-economic data are available. However, the administrators estimated that the students were approximately representative of the District of Columbia with regard to family income, socio-economic factors, and race. All students in the orchestra had to actively solicit funds, with the soliciting help of others, to pay for their fare to Europe.

3. Results

a. One thousand one hundred and thirty-four students received and completed a summer program of high quality professional instructions in music from specialist musician-teachers.

b. Their interest was demonstrated by a 99.6 percent perfect attendance record; i.e. only five out of 1,139 students dropped out of the program and even those were for unavoidable reasons.

c. Last year's summer program continued to meet voluntarily every Saturday for half a day with 700 to 800 pupils attending. This year's summer program is scheduled to continue in the same way.

d. The D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra completed their preparation, gave a successful concert at Watergate, and went to Switzerland.

e. The 130 students in the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra raised the money for their own transportation and the transportation of their teachers to Switzerland.

f. The D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra will meet twice weekly during the coming school year to continue their studies.

g. The D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra was invited by Von Karajan to West Berlin in 1972.

h. As this evaluation report was being prepared, word was received from Switzerland that 30 of the students were chosen for the International Orchestra. The International Orchestra has 120 seats. People to fill the seats were chosen from among the ten selected orchestras of eight countries. The District of Columbia Youth Symphony Orchestra in this program won one-quarter of the awarded positions! In addition, the 17 year old cellist in the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra was awarded one of the three scholarships to study in Europe for a year.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. High quality instructions from specialist musician teachers; i.e. instrument instructions were given by specialists in the particular instruments.

b. An amazing expression of interest by 99.6 percent attendance of the 1,139 students.

c. Outstanding opportunities in music education and experience for the 130 students in the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra.

d. Local community involvement opportunities with great interest expressed by the parents of the 1,139 students. International community involvement opportunities, in the best sense, offered by the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra's trip abroad.

e. Good opportunities for students with common music interests to exchange ideas and relate to each other both in the local community and internationally.

f. There were employment opportunities for 18 students in the D. C. Youth Symphony Orchestra who earned $56.10 per week as Student Aides and probably used the money for their trip to Switzerland.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. The program had to use poor quality, sometimes defective, instruments.

b. The program lacked sufficient instruments, lacked recording equipment, and needed more and better space. The available space was insufficient, had bad acoustics, was often very dirty, had interruptive noises, and students had to worry about being chased out by the janitor, e.g. in the middle of a Beethoven rehearsal, because doors had to be locked or rooms vacated. Good recording equipment, essential for certain kinds of instructions, was not available.

c. There was weak or insufficient liaison between this program and the regular District of Columbia Public School music programs.

d. There was a lack of needed administrative and clerical assistance. Volunteer administrative assistants could not handle everything that needed to be done.

3. Recommendations

a. Funds should be made available to provide the instruments and recording equipment needed in keeping with the high quality standards of instructions and interest demonstrated by this program.

b. Better and more space facilities should be made available for instructions, rehearsals, and small group practice.

c. Additional funds would enable needed training in orchestration, composition, and conducting. These subjects are presently largely omitted from the program because of lacking funds.

d. Provisions should be made for administrative and clerical assistance for this program.

e. This program should be publicized in the District of Columbia as well as in the school community. It is an exemplary model of high quality education, outstanding interest, and extraordinary results.

f. Considering the number of non-achieving and dropout students in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, a much closer look might well be taken at a program with 99.6 percent attendance by 1,139 students, (during a hot summer, with limited equipment, in hot humid facilities), voluntary year-round educational continuance on Saturdays, cooperative parental and community involvement, and, while representing the United States at an International Festival, winners of 25 percent of the positions awarded to the students of eight nations. Study might reveal how this kind of quality, interest, morale, and success could be achieved elsewhere. There really are not so very many other places to look.

CHAPTER 9

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ORIENTATION PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mr. Roy T. Cogdell

2. Location of Project: Georgetown University

3. Date Begun: June 21, 1970 Date Completed: August 14, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

50 Students (sophomores and juniors from District of Columbia high schools)
1 Director
1 Coordinator
14 Teachers
1 Senior Counselor
6 Tutor Counselors

5. Cost: $20,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of the program was twofold. First, to identify students who had the intellectual potential requisite for success in college, but who, for a variety of reasons, had not performed satisfactorily in high school; and second, to acquaint these students with selected aspects of college life which could contribute to their success after admission.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide intellectual and cultural stimulation for students, from low income families, who have college potential but have had academic difficulties in high school.

b. To help qualified students understand that college is within their grasp and that it is a desirable goal; to give them confidence that they have the capacity and can develop the abilities to do college work.

c. To provide additional skills necessary for college through the review and study of needed academic subjects.

d. To act as a supplement for secondary school college preparation.

e. To help students consider colleges of their choice.

f. To simulate a college environment including social and academic experiences.

g. To provide information about available financial aid and scholarship opportunities.

2. Procedures

The Georgetown University College Orientation Program was a compensatory education project designed for high school students in the District of Columbia. It provided intensive instructions in English, reading, mathematics, biology, and chemistry. In addition, cultural activities and individual counseling services were available to each student. It can therefore be characterized as remedial as well as enrichment program with the primary emphasis directed toward increasing the likelihood that these students will be admitted to and succeed in college.

Fifty students from District of Columbia Secondary Schools participated in the program. In order to select the 50 students, large group meetings were held to which potentially interested students were invited. Many students attended upon the recommendation of their counselors. After hearing the criteria for admission to the summer program at these large meetings, some students eliminated themselves. Others were eliminated by their teachers and counselors. One factor in the elimination was that this program was designed specifically to aid serious college-bound students who were ready to work for greater assurance of being accepted by a college or university. In this program, academic subject matter was dealt with intensively. Thus if any teacher, counselor, or the student himself, felt that the student was not sincerely committed to pursue an academic course of study, he was automatically eliminated. The following were used as final criteria for selecting students:

a. Grades (had to be below assumed potential of student)
b. Two interviews
c. Recommendation of counselor and teachers
d. Personal information on the application had to document low family income.
e. Parental questionnaires

After the students were selected, they were divided into sophomore and junior groups only. They were assigned for class sessions, discussions, counseling, and tutorial training. They lived in the college dormitories but could go home for weekends.

3. Results

a. All students received intensive training in English, reading, mathematics, biology, and chemistry.

b. Students had cultural activities and counseling services.

c. A large percentage of students enrolled in this program has entered college. Cursory follow-up surveys indicated that:

(1) Thirty-three of 40 students who completed the program in 1965 enrolled in college.

(2) Twenty-eight of the 44 who completed the program in 1966 are now enrolled in college.

(3) Thirty of 37 students who completed the program in 1967 are enrolled in college.

Number and Percentage of Students Enrolled in Program Who Entered College

Year Enrolled	Number Enrolled	Number Who Entered College	Percent
1965	40	33	82
1966	44	28	63
1967	37	30	81
1968	50	*	--
1969	52	*	--
1970	50	*	--

For the year 1965, 82 percent of the students participating in the program enrolled in college. In 1966, there was a decrease in the number of students enrolling in college to 63 percent. However, in 1967, 81 percent enrolled in college.

d. Twenty-nine members of the 1967 class have reported receiving a total of $32,000 in scholarship aid for that school year. Members of the 1969 class have reported receiving a total of $42,000 in scholarship aid.

e. Admission officers in 18 major colleges have reported to the director in 1970 that participation in the Georgetown University College

*Still unknown to program.

Orientation Program had been highly influential in securing admission and financial aid for the students.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Low income students with college potential received eight weeks of intensive training in English, reading, mathematics, biology, and chemistry.

b. Students were given the opportunity to experience a college atmosphere.

c. Students were encouraged to develop their academic levels of aspiration.

d. The students were totally immersed in activities related to college life. Their rigorous daily schedule began at 8:30 a.m. and ended at 4:00 p.m.

e. Individual tutoring and counseling were available to all participants.

f. Students attended plays, concerts and other cultural activities.

g. Students received a dormitory living experience. However, they were permitted to go home on weekends if they chose.

h. All students received fifteen dollars per week stipends for personal expenses.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Funding came too late for adequate planning time; it came so late that Georgetown University had to provide interim emergency funds.

b. "Hostility toward authority was expressed by many students, with resultant negativism, in the name of self assertion and 'Black pride'. These same factors caused flagrant disregard for curfew hours by girls".*

c. There seemed to be insufficient stimulation for some, and apathy among a few students was noted.

d. "Students asserted (without foundation) that the university was against them because they were Black".*

*Quoted statement of Program Director.

3. Recommendations

a. The eight week period for the project seemed adequate for its purposes.

b. Funds should be allocated in early spring to enable more planning time and so that the university will not have to provide interim emergency funds.

c. More counseling should be done by professional counselors.

d. The Assistant Director and the Director should be relieved of counseling duties. This could be taken care of within the context of recommendation number three if it were implemented.

e. A formal follow-up of all program participants should identify their academic successes and problems after returning to high school.

f. Since all participants came from low-income families, cooperation might be considered between this project and an organization that would finance or give financial assistance to capable students who wish to enroll in college but lack financial means.

CHAPTER 10

GODDARD SPACE CENTER

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Marylin Krupsaw

2. Location of Project: Goddard Space Center

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: August 21, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

38 Students from District of Columbia high schools and vocational schools, primarily, juniors and seniors.
2 Coordinators
1 Counselor
38 Supervisors of Departments at Goddard Space Center

5. Cost: $3,500 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

This summer incentive project taught trade skills, such as welding, provided science laboratory learning experiences, and offered preparation for part-time employment and scholarships.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide apprenticeship training opportunities for students from low income families who are interested in learning technical trades related to science.

b. To provide a one-to-one relationship learning experience between the student and a highly skilled technician in the vocational area of the student's interest.

2. Procedures

a. Thirty-eight students, juniors and seniors in District of Columbia high schools, were selected for this special instruction program. All students were required to:

(1) come from low income families, and

(2) be interested in science.

There were no academic requirements except their teachers' recommendations regarding their interest in participation.

b. Each of the 38 students were assigned to one of 38 Department Supervisors at the Goddard Space Center for the full eight weeks.

c. The 38 students were brought to the Goddard Space Center daily by chartered bus and attended from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

d. Each student had the opportunity to learn a group of occupational skills directly from the department supervisor to whom he was assigned in an apprenticeship relation.

e. In addition to occupational skills, students also learned about the world of work from the supervisor who, in all cases, was an experienced, mature specialist.

f. Students received $1.40 per hour for the entire eight weeks. This provided needed funds for their low income families as well as the morale factors that come with earning money.

3. Results

a. Students learned drafting, electrical circuitry, meteorology, computer operations, biological laboratory work, electronic measurement with instruments, welding, and other technical skills.

b. Students received $1.40 per hour for the entire eight weeks.

c. Several students obtained additional part-time or full-time employment.

d. Of the original group of 25 students at Goddard in the summer of 1967, 22 won college scholarships. All 22 are presently in their college programs.

e. Weekly career seminars and training in being interviewed for a job were also provided.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This program acquainted students with the world of work by having them experience it directly with a skilled, experienced, specialist in the trades of their interest.

b. The program made available educational opportunities for careers in the sciences.

c. The program taught technical skills of value to the sciences.

d. This program provided unusually valuable one-to-one experience and learning opportunities with an expert in an apprenticeship situation.

e. Many students obtained preparation for college scholarships, special training, or employment.

f. Transportation arrangements were very good.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

Because of limited funds, there were not enough paid apprenticeship positions for all of the available students who qualified. There were approximately three times as many qualified students as apprenticeships.

3. Recommendations

a. More paid apprenticeships should be made available to District of Columbia students who qualify for this program. There should be such an apprenticeship program available to every student who qualifies.

b. There should be less strict regulations on the definition of "low income" requirements. The director of the program said that some students did not qualify technically, even though they were poor and needed a training program, because their family income was not quite low enough.

c. There should be detailed follow-up studies of the students who participated in these summer programs. Their academic and vocational successes and problems could help in planning future apprenticeship programs.

d. The District of Columbia Public Schools might consider a greater involvement in, and coordination with, this program than its present funding involvement which is limited to the cost of bus transportation. Perhaps help could be given to providing more of the needed paid apprenticeships. This seems like an exemplary program of excellent quality which is especially needed by qualified students from low income families.

CHAPTER 11

GONZAGA SUMMER SCHOOL HIGHER ACHIEVEMENT PROJECT

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Father H. Cornell Bradley, S. J.

2. Location of Project: Gonzaga High School

3. Date Begun: June 29, 1970 Date Completed: August 7, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

60 Students, all boys, entering the 8th and 9th grades in September 1970
7 Teachers
4 Tutors
1 Director

5. Cost: $5,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project was to help students, from low income families, who had good academic potential but low achievement develop their maximum level of performance by providing them with instructions as well as enrichment and motivational activities. The students were encouraged to consider college and given college preparatory work.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To help students achieve their academic potential.

b. To provide students with experiences beyond their own neighborhoods through field trips.

c. To keep the student/teacher ratio small in order that students could be given counseling in addition to individualized academic instructions.

d. To stress the importance of academic training and to encourage students to develop justified motivation to develop their educational potentials. Students were encouraged to study for maximum achievement.

2. Procedures

The Gonzaga program provided help for junior high school students with high academic abilities but low achievement results in various subject areas.

Sixty junior high school boys were served by the program. They were selected at their own schools. Students were selected on the following bases:

a. Students had to come from low income families.

b. Forty-seven of the 60 students were from Title I schools.

c. Students had to be scheduled to enter the 8th or 9th grade in the fall of 1970.

d. Students had to have academic and college potential but be underachieving.

e. Their grade level in reading had to be below their potential.

f. A 100 word composition was written by students about why they wanted to attend.

g. Additional information was provided by the school counselors regarding individual pupils.

The referral of students was not completed until June 1970. Since only 60 students were referred, real selectivity was not possible as there were no other candidates at such a late date. D. C. Transit bus tickets were provided for the free transportation of students to the program. Milk and doughnuts were provided before classes began each day. Free lunches were provided for all students.

Five of the seven teachers in the project had worked in the Gonzaga Summer Program of 1969. The others were selected on the basis of their qualifications and interest. The director met with his staff, for one week prior to the program, to organize classes and develop the curriculum for instructions. Also, weekly staff meetings were held to discuss and evaluate each student and to plan for the coming week.

Students attended academic classes from 9:20 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. daily. At 1:45 p.m. daily, and on Saturdays, students had the choice of a sports program at the school (e.g. basketball team) or going on field trips. Trips included,

for example, the Carter Barron Theatre (at night), the National Geographic Society, various historical sites, the Naval Yard, the F.B.I. tour, the Smithsonian African Art Exhibit, NASA exhibit, Aquarium, local university campuses, Theodore Roosevelt Island, National Airport, Eastern Airlines tour of a plane, Marine Barracks, Jefferson Memorial, U.S. Capitol, and new housing developments. Students also had available the use of a special library on Contemporary Black Culture. They voluntarily read many paperback books of contemporary literature.

California Reading Tests were given at the end of the program. The California Arithmetic Test was given at the beginning of the program. This information was made available to each pupil's respective school and was so noted in the final reports that were sent to the schools.

3. Results

a. Fifty-nine of the students completed the program. One pupil had to leave after four weeks to get a job because his family had no income.

b. All students demonstrated a real desire to learn.

c. Students were particularly successful in developing study skills. A special ten minute guidance period was devoted to study techniques every morning.

d. Students met and learned to know more about people from other parts of the city.

e. As a result of participating in enriched educational experiences, students showed gains in cultural expression.

f. Students had alternatives to being "on the streets". They began to identify with their summer school group rather than with the out of school "gang".

g. Students became aware that learning could be fun.

h. Students began to express greater interest in school and community activities.

i. A report on the accomplishments of each student was sent to his regular school in time to be used when school began in fall 1970.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. "Inner-city" boys were given needed academic help.

b. There was a competent and interested staff of teachers.

c. There was a very capable director who related to "inner-city" Black youngsters.

d. There was a low pupil-teacher ratio with individual attention.

e. Weekly staff meetings to plan and discuss activities of the students were conducted.

f. Free lunches were provided for all student participants. They were also provided milk and doughnuts before classes started.

g. Evening activities and programs were provided.

h. Planned Saturday activities were provided.

i. An individual evaluation was sent to each student's regular school so as to be available to his teacher in September.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Students were referred in late May. This was too late for the best selection and additional recruitment of students. Only 60 were referred. Some of these seemed poor but not very poor, that is, not the most in need of such a program where very low income was a criterion. If referral had been done in February the program might have had more very needy students.

b. Time did not permit proper selection of some kinds of materials that the Director thought would have been more advantageous to participants. For example, Project Read materials would have been better than the SRA reading materials which were used. But preparation time was too short to get the more desirable materials and get ready to use them.

c. There were no Black teachers, with which Black inner-city students could identify, although there were two Black tutors. This did not create any overt problems but some Black teachers would be more desirable if they could be recruited for next year.

3. Recommendations

a. Provision should be made for the earlier identification and long-range recruitment of students for whom this program is appropriate. The very latest referral date would be March. The ideal referral date would be year-round. This would enable a better determination of student needs.

b. Black male teachers should be recruited as staff members. The students in this program are in need of Black adult male models with whom they can identify.

c. Recruitment for this program should be assisted by the regular schools throughout the year. Students from "low motivation families", with

regard to education, should be identified as early as possible. This could only be accomplished by year-round consideration of candidates for this summer program.

d. The field trips were good and adequate in number. However, the Director felt that some field trips should have been compulsory instead of having them all voluntary. He felt that some students selected too few of the valuable trips because they had no idea about what they would experience; such students needed the enriching field trips the most.

e. Instead of giving arithmetic achievement tests only at the beginning of the program and reading achievement tests only at the end of the program, both kinds of tests could be given on the first and last days of the program. This would assess what the students achieved in each subject from the summer program.

CHAPTER 12

LIBRARY

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Miss Olive C. DeBruler

2. Location of Project: Davis, Emery, Kimball, and R. K. Webb Elementary Schools

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

320 Students from four District of Columbia Elementary Schools
5 Librarians (full time)
1 Librarian (half time)

5. Cost: $4,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To support the on-going summer school teaching programs at four participating schools and to provide library books that neighborhood children could take home.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To support the on-going summer enrichment programs with library services at the four participating elementary schools.

b. To provide take-home books for children in the neighborhood who were not taking summer school programs.

c. To provide library resources for children, of ages six to 13, to maintain and develop their reading skills.

2. Procedures

a. Summer school pupils, regular pupils from the schools, and neighborhood children not in the schools were all invited to use the school reference and take-home libraries. However, there was no publicity that these libraries were open for the summer.

b. Library audio visual materials were also available for use in the schools.

c. The six librarians were regular District of Columbia Public School librarians, generally working in their own schools.

d. Library hours were 8:15 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. daily in keeping with summer school hours. They were not open on afternoons or Saturdays.

e. Neighborhood parents were invited to use the library too.

f. Summer Enrichment Program funds were used entirely for the salaries of the six librarians.

g. None of the libraries in the four schools were air-conditioned. The director said that many students came in spite of the heat but that more students would be attracted to use a library that was air-conditioned. She also said that parents of the students would have been more likely to have used an air-conditioned library.

3. Results

a. Three hundred and twenty students used the four libraries daily. This included those who took books home and those who did not.

b. Teachers indicated that the library resources and services helped their summer programs.

c. Not many parents came to the program.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Necessary library resources were made available to the Summer Enrichment Programs at four elementary schools.

b. Students voluntarily utilized their own school library facilities during the summer, often taking books home.

c. The program was staffed by regular District of Columbia Public School librarians, usually in their home school.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Because of late funding approval, staff had to be recruited at the last moment, principals did not know about the library program early enough, and flyers could not be distributed to let neighborhoods know about the open library.

b. More high interest, easy reading, books were needed. Such books do not exist; they are not written; it is not a matter of needed funds.

c. Acoustics in the libraries were of very poor quality; therefore the libraries were much too noisy.

3. Recommendations

a. Funding approval should come early enough for adequate planning, recruitment, and community liaison.

b. Program funds were adequate.

c. Window air conditioners for the libraries should be considered. One or two window units would do the job in each school. Outside sounds would also be helpfully reduced by air conditioning.

CHAPTER 13

MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- BRUCE PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Judy Williams

2. Location of Project: Bruce Elementary School

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

170 Students of ages 3 to 16
1 Director
13 Teachers
2 Teacher Aides
12 Parent Aides
2 Neighborhood Youth Corps Aides

5. Cost: $15,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide cultural enrichment for children in the Bruce School community during the summer and to give student and parent participants a voice in planning and implementing the program.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide a summer cultural enrichment program for children in the Bruce School community.

b. To encourage the children and their parents to plan and implement their own summer school program.

c. To provide educational and recreational activities for the entire families of the participating students.

d. To develop a school community learning and enrichment program with close family, school, and community cooperation.

2. Procedures

This is the third year of this summer program. One hundred and seventy students, of ages three to 16, applied in response to announcements in the Bruce School newsletter and neighborhood door-to-door recruitment efforts. All community applicants within the required age range were accepted.

The 170 students met daily from 9:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. Free hot lunches were provided. There were no formal academic subjects for the students. However, the program was planned to inspire interest and enjoyment in cultural and educational activities. In this sense, the children actually did have opportunities to learn about, for example, science, other cultures, history, and the fine arts. This was accomplished by field trips to such places as the Smithsonian Museum of History and Technology, the National Portrait Gallery, the Wax Museum, plays, the House and Senate Galleries, the Enchanted Forest, and many films with educational interest such as "Black History Stolen, Lost or Strayed" narrated by Bill Cosby.

Students also had classroom experiences where they could write, draw, and verbally express their feelings about the field trips. They had classes in visual arts, crafts, African culture, drama improvisation, charm, cooking, and sewing. There was physical education with baseball, swimming instructions, and other outdoor activities. The classes, physical education activities, and some of the field trips were grouped by age. The sewing and cooking classes were taught exclusively by paid Parent Aides.

In addition, there were classes for parents. This included high school equivalency courses, typing, shorthand, sewing, and consumer education. Approximately 40 parents attended the program, meeting twice weekly, with an average attendance of 25 parents. Arrangements were made so that parents could bring their children and leave them to watch a first rate film, such as "High Noon" or "Voyage to the Bottom of the Sea" while they attended the adult evening classes.

Because of the informality of the program, individual pupil records were limited to attendance and only information needed for the on-going program.

3. Results

a. All students completed the program with an average attendance of approximately 85 percent and nearly no absences for the majority.

b. The pupils seemed to gain from the learning and enrichment activities and field trips; some had never before visited any exhibits.

c. The pupils seemed to gain from the physical education and recreation program, especially in swimming. Three of the students learned to swim well enough to compete in a city-wide swimming match.

d. The sewing and charm program was very popular with the older girls.

e. Forty parents attended classes two evenings a week. Some of them took the Civil Service examinations for clerk typist jobs following the typing course. The consumer education classes also seemed especially valuable.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. The students had a summer program of enriching experiences with educational, recreational, and cultural activities.

b. There were excellent rapport and liaison among teachers, students, parents, and the community with all participating in the overall educational program.

c. Parents were given educational opportunities for self-improvement and in conducting classes.

d. The students had a good hot lunch.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. The program's half-day was too short for all the activities that were needed.

b. Funding approval came too late for needed program planning and staff preparation.

c. Because of the late funding, supplies did not arrive until very late, in some cases not until the program was completed; e.g. ordered electric fans arrived three weeks after the program ended.

d. Due to the extreme heat and humidity in the Bruce School, learning as well as enjoyment was diminished. Sometimes the program had to be ended before scheduled because of the heat.

e. There was no auditorium or multi-purpose room for large group sessions.

3. Recommendations

a. Funding approval should come early enough for adequate planning and supply ordering.

b. The program should be longer, i.e. eight weeks instead of six.

c. There should be eight air-conditioned classrooms for this program; the school library should also be air-conditioned. Since there are up and down wooden windows in the classrooms, window units would probably be adequate. The approximate cost might be no more than $300 per classroom including installation if the existing electric outlets can be used.

CHAPTER 14

MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- H. D. COOKE PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mr. James Faison

2. Location of Project: H. D. Cooke Elementary School

3. Date Begun: July 1, 1970 Date Completed: August 7, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

282 Students from all grades in the H. D. Cooke School community area
3 Teachers (2 teachers and the director serving as a teacher)
5 Parents (paid)

5. Cost: $5,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide enriching summer recreation program activities for elementary school children in the H. D. Cooke School neighborhood.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide neighborhood children, who would otherwise have no summer program, with interesting and enriching summer activities.

b. To provide Washington, D. C. area field trips which would interest students and give them things to think about and talk about.

c. To provide informal classes in arts, crafts, and written and oral expressiveness.

2. Procedures

Three days before the program began, descriptive leaflets were distributed to area homes by volunteer neighborhood parents. As a result of this publicity, 282 neighborhood pupils came to the program.

Students came to the H. D. Cooke School for four hours daily. Their program included instructional classes in art, sewing, photography, and crafts. They also had classes in creative writing and expressiveness. There were field trips to the Rock Creek Park Nature Center, the Zoo, Mount Vernon, Great Falls, MacDonald's Farm, National Airport, and picnics. Students were encouraged to express themselves creatively, regarding their field trip experiences, in the classes. An average week included three days of classroom instructions and two days for field trips. Bus transportation was provided free. Lunches were provided voluntarily by the teachers and neighborhood parents.

3. Results

a. Approximately 40 students attended nearly every day of the program. Approximately 240 students attended occasionally depending upon the activity for the day and their interest. Maximal daily attendance was as much as 80 students for certain field trips; e.g. to Mount Vernon.

b. The teachers indicated that the students seemed to learn with interest from their classroom instructions. Nearly all students made arts and crafts projects.

c. No formal reports were made for the regular school records since the program was essentially recreational in purpose.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Students who attended regularly seemed genuinely interested in the activities. Those who were less interested, apparently did not feel pressured to attend.

b. Since an average day had only about 50 students, there were few students per instructor which permitted individual instructions, e.g. in crafts or the arts.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Funding for this program was not approved until late in June. This did not leave enough time for adequate program planning and staffing.

b. Because of the lateness of funding, needed materials such as arts and crafts supplies, could not be ordered to arrive on time.

c. Because of the heat and humidity in the building, classrooms were so uncomfortable at times that it made students reluctant to return, let alone learn effectively. This explained, at least partly, the greater popularity of the outside field trips.

d. Because of the very great turnover in student attendance, it was impossible for teachers to plan really effective instructional programs. Furthermore the students on any given day might be from any grade or age grouping.

3. Recommendations

a. Funding should come early enough for adequate planning, staffing, and ordering of materials.

b. There should be air-conditioned classrooms to increase student interest and learning effectiveness in the instructional programs.

c. The sporadic attendance whereby only 40 or 50, of 282 students enrolled in the program, came on any one day greatly reduced the program's effectiveness and efficiency. The teachers never knew who would be in their classes for any subject on any day.

d. The director recommended that one or two overnight field trips, e.g. to visit historical places of student interest, would help the program. He also recommended that arrangements be made to use a swimming pool.

e. All things considered, especially the sporadic attendance and very limited interest of students in the classes, and the uncomfortable classrooms, this might better be planned as a daily recreation program. The director's idea of going to a pool, perhaps with swimming instructors, seems more productive than classes where only 40 or 50 of 282 enrolled students appear on any one day.

CHAPTER 15

MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION -- SEATON PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Annie Neal

2. Location of Project: Park View and Seaton Elementary Schools and Cardozo High School

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

500 Students, from pre-school to 12th grade, from 19 Model School Division schools
1 Director
150 Teachers
35 Teacher Aides

5. Cost: $65,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds used in conjunction with Title I Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide learning experiences for children in the areas of reading, science, mathematics, social studies, instrumental and vocal music, theatre arts, dance, and esthetics.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide learning experiences for children, from pre-school to grade 12, in the subject areas of reading, science, mathematics, social studies, instrumental and vocal music, theatre arts, dance, and esthetics.

b. To cultivate existing talents and seek undiscovered talents in the fine arts.

c. To provide an interrelation of learning experiences among all subjects.

d. To develop innovative uses of television and other media for the enhancement of the curriculums.

2. Procedures

Students were selected on the basis of expressed interest or teacher referral because of their interest. However, students had to come from one of the Title I schools in the Model School Division. The program was from 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. daily. Students generally lived within walking distance of the program. Free lunches were available for all students.

Students had a choice of two kinds of programs. They could choose either the esthetic education program or an academic program in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies. The esthetic education program included instrumental and voice music, dance, and theatre arts.

There was a pupil to teacher ratio of approximately one teacher for every three students. However, the actual pupil to teacher ratio was determined by the learning situation. Sometimes there was small group teaching and sometimes a team teaching approach with, for example, five teachers and one aide to 16 students, or even up to ten teachers and 35 students. Sometimes the teaching was one-to-one or even several teachers for one student. Often a teacher worked with her group of three or four students in a large room where other such groups were also working. Strategies, of course, varied with student ages, grade levels, subject content, abilities, and needs. The teaching staff met every afternoon to plan lessons, teaching strategies, and groupings for the next day.

The program was supplemented with field trips, sometimes using chartered buses. These included visits to area esthetic and cultural resources (e.g. the African Museum) as well as walks in the neighborhood to encourage opportunities for student self-expression. Telling about what they saw on a field trip or a neighborhood walk helped students develop self confidence as well as oral expressiveness.

Individual teachers used assessment and testing measures for remedial, improved teaching, or developmental assessment purposes. However, there were no formal tests or assessment procedures or records for all students.

3. Results

a. Eighty percent of the 500 students completed the program. The teachers said that all who completed the program seemed to make definite learning gains in the subject areas as well as gains in self confidence and improved self perception.

b. The teachers said that all students made at least some gains in self expression and relating to each other and teachers.

c. The director said that all students achieved some degree of success. However, she also said that only measures of success were considered because failure was not recognized as such, that the focus was only on degrees of success.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. The great flexibility of the program and the low number of pupils per teacher permitted an unusual degree of individual and special attention to student learning needs.

b. Students had a choice of two different kinds of programs, i.e., esthetic education or academic subjects.

c. Daily meetings of the teaching staff enabled on-going staff development and improved teaching methodologies.

d. The flexibility of program planning permitted a variety of innovative strategies.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. It was not known until June 15 that the project was fully funded. This prevented maximally effective planning, staffing, and student selection.

b. The director said that there were insufficient funds for adequate field trips and better teaching materials. She specified that an additional $15,000 could have provided teachers with all the materials they needed.

3. Recommendations

a. The program should be funded early enough, i.e. by April, to enable adequate planning, staff recruitment, and the identification and selection of student applicants.

b. The unusually low number of students per teacher, -- i.e. 150 teachers plus 35 teacher aides for 500 students -- could have made available to the District of Columbia Public Schools a wealth of invaluable information about the different uses of teacher-to-pupil ratio if this variable had been carefully documented. With no such documenting records, we do not really know when there are significant learning advantages or disadvantages with one pupil to one teacher, one teacher to four pupils, ten teachers to 40 pupils, or several

teachers for one pupil. If this variable, of teacher-to-pupil ratio, was not a significant factor in and of itself, that too would have been invaluable information. It is therefore recommended that next year's program not lose the opportunity to provide such needed innovative information for other school programs.

c. There should also be follow-up studies to identify the values of the program for the students during their academic year following the summer program. Such information could help program planning for the following year.

d. The unique opportunities for innovative education findings afforded by a teaching staff of 185 for 500 students do seem to warrant the best teaching materials and resources. Additional funds should be considered for a carefully prepared list of such supplies and field trips to resources.

CHAPTER 16

PRIMARY SUMMER SCHOOLS

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Directors: Mrs. Carolyn R. Preston, Mrs. Joyce P. Jackson

2. Location of Project: Barnard, Beers, Bowen, Bryan, Burroughs, Congress Heights, Crummell, H. D. Cooke, Davis, Draper, Drew, Emery, Garrison, Gibbs, Goding, Harris, Hendley, Kimball, Kenilworth, Lafayette, Langston, LaSalle, K. Lewis, Logan, Lovejoy, McGogney, Maury, Meyer, Miner, Monroe, Montgomery, Murch, Orr, Petworth, Powell, Savoy, Shadd, Simmons, Smothers, Stoddert, Sumner, Takoma, Thomas, Van Ness, Walker-Jones, Watkins, Webb, and J. O. Wilson Elementary Schools.

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

2,237 Students in Kindergarten thru 3rd grade
23 Principals
106 Classroom Teachers (48 of them were also "Head Teachers")

5. Cost: $175,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The major purpose of the Primary Summer Schools was to teach reading skills. Coupled with this was the aim to provide experiences which would motivate children to express their own ideas about the things they know, thereby improving their verbal communications and reading comprehension.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To strengthen reading and communications skills.

b. To motivate students for exploratory learning by providing creative challenges of personal interest to them.

c. To structure a program around the life experiences of children, their interest in nature, in games, in family and friends, and in the many activities centered around their local neighborhood and school.

d. To explore the values of innovative methods and approaches for stimulating interest and developing reading and communications skills.

2. Procedures

The Primary Summer School was a six-week program designed to strengthen the reading and communication skills of participating pupils in kindergarten through the third grade. Various teaching innovations and reading programs encouraged students to improve their reading and communication skills. The major emphasis and focus of the program was on the enrichment and strengthening of skills rather than grade advancement.

The regular school teachers and principal recommended students for this program in the spring of 1970. Applications were sent home with students in April and May. Primary Summer School teachers selected participants on the bases of returned applications, recommendations by the regular teachers and principals, and eligibility requirements.

Selection criteria included the following eligibility requirements:

a. A student had to be working below his expected grade level. Results of the most recent assessments were considered.

b. There had to be a reasonable expectation that the student could profit from the program.

c. Teacher recommendation of the pupil for the program.

d. Reasonable assurance that the pupil would attend the entire six-week program regularly as scheduled.

e. Parental approval of the student's regular participation.

f. Grade level placement in the program was based on the grade that students were expected to enter in September 1970.

The program was staffed mainly by teachers who had worked with the program before the summer of 1970. All teachers participated in a preparatory workshop before the program began.

The following methods and innovations were included in the Primary Summer School Program: small classes (15 to 20 students per class, sometimes combining classes and teachers for team teaching and experience sharing as

needed); individualized reading instruction; use of children's experiences for building vocabulary; writing experience charts and stories rather than just using basal readers to teach reading; using field trips in and out of the school area, films, filmstrips, and records; SRA machines for programmed instruction; and participation in other on-going programs such as Language Arts and Recreation Department activities. There were also free lunches, swimming, painting in the parks, and group singing in the parks. Teachers kept records and made reports regularly of their students' progress in reading.

3. Results

The program was successful in providing its learning and development opportunities for the children. Teachers noticed a general improvement in pupils' interest toward reading and greater communicability as well as considerable gains in the quality of both reading and communications. Teachers felt that this was partly due to the flexibility of the program in which each child was allowed to progress at his own rate with individualized consideration. Shy, withdrawn students were encouraged to participate and actually became more verbal and active in the classroom.

The life experiences of the children were an important reading tool. After taking field trips, students were encouraged to write about their experiences and to talk about them with their fellow students. Children wrote about their own families and other subjects familiar to them.

A pupil achievement report, with individualized details about every pupil in the summer program, was sent to each pupil's regular school in time to be used by his teacher in September 1970.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. The primary program objectives were met in that individual learning opportunities in reading and communications were made available for each pupil. Both reading and communication skills were improved in quality although they could not be quantified.

b. Field trips and other cultural experiences were used constructively and constituted an important part of the reading program.

c. Teachers felt that the relaxed classroom atmosphere coupled with the large variety of available reading resources greatly enhanced the summer program.

d. Parents were generally enthusiastic about this program. Many attended the open houses held by the various schools and participated in the program in other ways.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. There were insufficient funds in the 1970 Summer Program to pay for any teacher aides. This meant individualized instructions could not be carried out as fully as desirable.

b. It was very difficult for the principals who were in charge of the program in more than one school to provide adequate supervision in more than one place.

c. Most of the classrooms were uncomfortable enough from the city heat and humidity to significantly interfere with comfort, interest, and probably learning.

d. Many of the teachers would like to see a greater parent involvement in the program.

e. All of the teachers indicated the importance of the field trips and would like this part of the program expanded.

3. Recommendations

a. This program helped serve the reading and communication needs of selected primary school children and should be continued next summer.

b. There should be sufficient funds for the 1971 Summer Program to employ at least one Teacher Aide for each class.

c. Each school should have one principal or supervisor in charge of the summer program.

d. At least one Community Aide should be assigned to work with each summer program school to enhance liaison with the community and bring to the attention of the program special neighborhood factors which might affect the pupils' learning.

e. The successful aspects of the Primary Summer Schools should be carried over into the regular school program.

f. If possible, even more field trips should be provided.

g. Although there is much evidence of good parent involvement, even greater emphasis should be placed on this aspect of the program.

h. There were evidences that the pupils could have learned more effectively in air-conditioned classrooms.

i. Teachers felt that many children could benefit from more instructions in the values of the various foods needed for body development.

CHAPTER 17

PUPIL PERSONNEL -- CHILD AND YOUTH STUDY SUMMER PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Miss Anna Johnson

2. Location of Project: "Pupil Personnel Centers Two and Four"

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

318 Students, in grades Kindergarten thru 12, from District of Columbia Public Schools
1 Director
8 School Psychologists
2 Psychometrists
3 School Social Workers
10 Pupil Personnel Aides
2 Clerks

5. Cost: $20,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide individual assessment and evaluation services for students during the summer. The findings and recommendations of these services should be available to the respective schools before classes begin in September.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. Individual pupil assessment.

b. Pupil evaluation for proper school placement services.

c. Recommendations for remedial or special instructions.

d. Referrals to Special Education for tuition grants.

e. Referrals for transfer to other District schools for special services or to avoid special (e.g. emotional) difficulties in the present school setting.

2. Procedures

The 318 pupils were individually referred by their own school to a Pupil Personnel Center. They received individual testing, assessment, interviews, and related services as needed, over a period of one or several days. They did not receive therapy or instructions, only assessment.

The Pupil Personnel Aides or a social worker attempted to meet with the parents or guardian of every pupil in the program. Counseling services were scheduled with parents as well as pupils to discuss pupil strengths and weaknesses, special needs, career plans, and available school programs, special services, or tuition grants.

Following these services, a report was prepared for every student and sent to the teachers that they would have when they resume regular school in September. The report identified the assessment factors related to realistic academic planning, pupil strengths and weaknesses, needs for remedial work, and special recommendations. Reports were sent early enough for use on the very first day of school in the 1970 fall semester.

3. Results

a. Three hundred and eighteen pupil referrals were received.

b. Two hundred and ninety-eight pupils received assessment services.

c. Individual reports were sent to the schools of the 318 pupils before school began in September.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Case services were individual with a strong professional staff.

b. Pupil assessment services were received during the summer; pupils did not have to wait until September.

c. A report was sent to each pupil's own school in time to be given to his new teacher in September; i.e. all reports were sent to the pupils' schools by August 5th.

d. There was personal contact between Pupil Personnel workers and the parents or guardian of every pupil served.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. There was insufficient time to provide ideal services. It would be best to have the summer program continue from the close of school in June to the opening of school in September.

b. Additional staff was needed, especially psychologists and social workers. This is especially true because of the importance of liaison with the home by the social worker and aides.

c. Pupils and parents did not have adequate funds for transportation to the Centers.

3. Recommendations

a. There should be sufficient funds to have this summer program continue from the close of school in June until the opening of school in September. Besides the direct values of assessment services, information from this program could greatly help teachers to help pupils in their regular classes.

b. Funds for additional staff psychologists and social workers would enable more comprehensive liaison between school workers and parents.

c. The director felt that pupil services would be more complete if there were funds to add a Special Education Placement Specialist to the program staff.

d. There should be funds to reimburse needy low income pupils and parents for their transportation costs to the Center.

CHAPTER 18

PUPIL PERSONNEL -- SUMMER DROPOUT PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Miss Roberta Fitzgerald

2. Location of Project: "Pupil Personnel Center, Number One"

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

1,885 Students, age 16 and above, from District of Columbia Public Schools
1 Director
6 Counselors
18 Project Aides
2 Clerks

5. Cost: $20,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To help dropouts from District of Columbia Public Schools, age 16 and over, to return to school or vocational services.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide summer counseling, vocational guidance, and other services to dropouts from District of Columbia Public Schools.

b. To establish contact with every dropout and his parents, including a home visit, and to plan for his return to school or a realistic vocational career.

c. To provide referral services and coordinate other agency resources as needed.

2. Procedures

a. Lists of all known dropouts automatically go to this project.

b. A face-to-face contact was attempted with every dropout student on the list. This contact was made at his home; contact was also attempted with his parents.

c. An appointment was made for the student to confer with project personnel at the Pupil Personnel Center. During this conference the discussion included student needs, plans, available possibilities, and how the school services might help. A report was made of every student conference.

d. Individual reports were sent to the school that the student would attend in September or to special training programs.

e. Vocational and educational counseling were provided and services were made available for future use even if currently rejected by the dropout; i.e. he is always welcome to come back at any age. If he rejected services, a report on this was also referred to his school.

f. Referrals for other District agency services were made if needed.

3. Results

a. One thousand eight hundred and eighty-five District of Columbia students who dropped out of school were referred for services.

b. One thousand three hundred and twenty-six of these students were contacted by the 1970 Summer Dropout Program staff.

c. One thousand two hundred and sixty-eight of the students received program services.

d. Liaison was established with the families of 407 students.

e. A great many of the dropout pupils who were served said that they planned to return to District of Columbia Public Schools or other school programs. A follow-up survey will be made in the fall semester to determine the number of such students who actually did that.

f. Five hundred and fifty-nine pupils were unable to be contacted.

g. Four hundred and forty-nine of the dropout students rejected the services.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Personal contact, case services, and individual counseling was attempted with every dropout.

b. Liaison with families was attempted for every case.

c. Referral resources of other agencies were considered and utilized.

d. There is always an "Open Door Policy" for future Pupil Personnel or other District of Columbia Public School services.

e. Reports on every case were sent to the students' respective schools, by August 5th, to enable their use as soon as school resumes in September.

f. Follow-up studies of students in this program, and their progress, are planned.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. There were difficulties in locating dropouts because of their moving and/or not being at home.

b. Six weeks was insufficient time for adequate counseling and follow-up services for all the students who needed them. When the summer program ended on July 31st, these services had to be discontinued until school would resume again in September; this time loss caused a gap in services for some students.

3. Recommendations

a. This should be a year-round program with adequate funding for continual services. Presently, there is a gap in services from July 31st until school resumes in September. There should either be a budget to fill the gap, or, better yet for program effectiveness, a single budget to enable this much-needed program for dropouts to operate 52 weeks a year.

b. Close liaison is needed with the whole school system to bring these services to dropouts as soon as possible; i.e. as immediately as possible from the time that they leave school.

c. Additional funds were needed for more staff, especially more project aides (i.e. at least twice as many) who establish contact with the student and his parents in the home. More counselors were also needed, especially for group counseling.

d. In summary, this seems like a fine program that offers desperately needed services for 47 weeks a year. However, these services for school dropouts should be available 52 weeks a year. As a matter of fact, the five weeks that the services are not available, just prior to when school begins in September, may be the most critical period in the year because it is the time of decision. The dropout student who doesn't enter his regular class in September may lose the whole semester, or never return.

CHAPTER 19

ST. ALBANS, INTERNATIONAL SEMINARS

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mr. John F. McCune

2. Location of Project: St. Albans School

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 24, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

36 Students, from 7th and 8th grades, selected from District of Columbia Junior High Schools
1 Director
5 Teachers

5. Cost: $6,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the program was to provide secondary school students with an intellectually stimulating experience in international studies. Its secondary purpose was to bring together as heterogeneous a group of students and school backgrounds as possible.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide a stimulating program in international studies to Junior High School students.

b. To bring together a heterogeneous group of students from various District of Columbia Public Schools.

2. Procedures

The St. Albans International Seminar was a coeducational program serving secondary school students. It provided an intellectually stimulating program in elementary international studies. Studies in language, historical background, and contemporary problems in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East were offered.

Students made applications and were recommended by guidance counselors and teachers. Thirty-six students were selected from the District of Columbia Public Schools and were financed by scholarships awarded by the District of Columbia Public School system. They were selected on the basis of their strong interest. There were no other criteria except that Title I school students were given preference. Students attended a half-day program. They were given free lunches and transportation.

Students were encouraged to study the course areas of their interest. Advantage was taken of resources in the Washington, D. C. metropolitan area and speakers from embassies, governmental offices, the Congress, and museums gave lectures in the international seminar. Field trips were made to embassies, governmental agencies, the Congress, and museums. All of the project staff had had years of teaching experience. The faculty as well as the guest speakers were men and women with extensive experience in the field of international studies.

The 36 District of Columbia Public School students shared their five teachers with approximately twice as many students, from private schools and other cities, representing a variety of cultures, socio-economic levels, nationalities, and background experiences.

3. Results

a. The seminars were a success, academically. Classes were vital and varied. Thirty-two of the 36 District of Columbia Public School students completed the program.

b. Students had opportunities to meet other students from a great variety of geographic, social, economic and national backgrounds.

c. Students gained enrichment experiences which they could utilize during the school year.

d. Students seemed to gain interest in learning more about the world of other cultures.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Students had unique opportunities to learn with and about their peers from other cities, countries, social and cultural backgrounds and experiences.

b. Students could learn from each other and relate to each other as well as with the teachers.

c. The St. Albans setting was an excellent environment for this program.

d. The teaching faculty and program content were of high quality.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. There were not enough Title I students in the program. Less than half of the 36 students were from target Title I and Impact Aid schools even though they were given selection preference. Not enough students seemed interested.

b. Funding came too late to adequately plan how to attract students who need this kind of program enrichment.

3. Recommendations

a. The director said that if funding would come in such a way that year-round planning would be possible, planning and student recruitment could be very much improved.

b. Planning should include year-round publicizing of this program, especially in Title I and Impact Aid schools.

CHAPTER 20

SCIENCE -- INTRODUCTORY PHYSICAL SCIENCE

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Dr. Harold Eagleson

2. Location of Project: Howard University

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

30 Students, in the 8th and 9th grades, from District of Columbia Junior High Schools
1 Director
1 Associate Director
1 Teacher
2 Laboratory Instructors
3 Guest Consultant-Lecturers
30 Teacher Participants

5. Cost: $800.00 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To train District of Columbia junior high school teachers in the use of innovative and modern science programs. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science subject content, and to understand the developmental psychology aspects of teaching and learning science. Concurrently, to assist interested students in learning more about the sciences.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. This was a staff development program to qualify and prepare District of Columbia junior high school teachers to use modern and innovative science program curriculums.

b. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science, and subject and curricula content.

c. To provide interested students with an intensive program in the sciences.

d. To review the developmental and psychological factors involved in teaching and learning science subjects.

2. Procedures

Thirty 8th and 9th grade students were selected from various District of Columbia junior high schools on the basis of their interest in learning more about the sciences and the consent of their parents. Thirty teachers currently teaching in District of Columbia junior high schools were selected, one from each of 30 schools, on the basis of their interest in the program. They had to qualify for admittance to the Howard University Graduate School in order to be able to receive three to six graduate semester hours of credit for completion of this program. The participating teachers were given stipends of $60.00 per week plus an additional $15.00 per week per dependent up to a maximum of four dependents.

The teacher participants attended the program from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. daily. The students were taught "Introductory Physical Science" by a regular science teacher and attended classes for a half day daily. The student class served to teach the new science program to the students and also as a demonstration and tryout class for the teacher participants.

In addition the teacher participants had classes for the other half day where they learned skills, techniques, strategies, subject content, and became familiar with the materials of the program. They reviewed the developmental and psychological aspects of learning science subjects as it pertains to junior high school students. They had lectures, seminars, laboratories, field trips, and special workshops with video tape analyses of their teaching styles in the demonstration classes. Participant teachers had many field trips to area science exhibits.

There were no formal achievement measures of either the teacher participants or students. The students received regular junior high school credit for this science course on the basis of their participation.

3. Results

a. All 30 teacher participants completed their training program successfully.

b. All 30 teacher participants will be utilizing this "Introductory Physical Science" curriculum in their classrooms in September 1970.

c. All 30 teacher participants were adequately prepared and qualified to teach the program. They expressed great interest and satisfaction with the innovative ways to teach, how they themselves learned, and looked forward to implementing the new curriculum in September.

d. The classroom teacher felt that the 30 pupils had gained at least as much as they could have gained from any regular science course and, in fact, had learned more and with much more interest and enthusiasm. The teacher said that this was true for all 30 students.

e. There will be follow-up studies of the teacher participants, monthly, throughout the school year to determine their capabilities and degrees of success with the new curriculum.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. The teacher participants met their primary objectives to become qualified and prepared to teach the innovative science curriculum, "Introductory Physical Science".

b. They had excellent experience-learning and practice teaching opportunities.

c. The students gained in subject information and science process skills as well as greater interest in learning about the sciences. Nearly all expressed a desire to continue their education in the sciences.

d. The students received regular junior high school credit for this science course on the basis of their participation.

e. The planned monthly follow-up studies can help future staff development and innovative curriculum programs in the sciences.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Many students, even though attending for only half a day, did not have adequate lunches.

b. Teacher participants at first resisted the innovative methodologies and were especially insecure with the "inquiry" approach of teaching mathematics related to the program. But, eventually, they liked the approach and preferred it. Although a problem, this was a natural anticipated problem.

3. Recommendations

a. This seems like an excellent program to prepare junior high school teachers to use a new and innovative science curriculum. The successes of both teachers and students suggest consideration of this approach for other subject areas. This kind of program should certainly be continued for the sciences in Summer 1971.

b. Good lunches should be available for all participating students, without cost to them, even though they attend for only half a day and may go home afterwards.

CHAPTER 21

SCIENCE -- SCIENCE CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT STUDY

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Dr. Roland Goddu

2. Location of Project: Catholic University

3. Date Begun: June 17, 1970 Date Completed: July 15, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

40 Students, in grades one thru six, from Eckington and Gage Elementary Schools
1 Director
1 Associate Director
34 Teacher Participants
24 Principal and Assistant Principal Participants
2 Full-time Laboratory Instructors
2 Full-time Instructors in Science Curriculum Improvement Study
2 Part-time Physics Instructors
1 Part-time Instructor in developmental psychology
3 Guest Consultant-Lecturers

5. Cost: $1,600 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To train District of Columbia elementary school teachers in the use of innovative and modern science programs. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science subject content, and to understand the developmental psychology aspects of teaching and learning science. Concurrently, to assist interested elementary school students in learning more about the sciences.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. This was a staff development program to qualify and prepare District of Columbia elementary school teachers to use modern and innovative science program curriculums.

b. To study in detail the developmental and psychological factors involved in learning and teaching science to elementary school students.

c. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science, and subject and curricula content.

d. To provide interested elementary school students with an intensive program in the sciences taught in keeping with their developmental levels.

2. Procedures

Forty students, in first through sixth grade, were selected from the Eckington and Gage Elementary Schools on the basis of their interest in learning more about the sciences. All had to have their parent's consent.

Thirty-four teachers and 24 principals and assistant principals, currently in District of Columbia elementary schools, were selected on the basis of their interest in the program. They had to qualify for admittance to the Catholic University Graduate School in order to be able to receive three to six graduate semester hours of credit for this program. The participants were given stipends of $60.00 per week plus an additional $15.00 per week per dependent up to a maximum of four dependents.

The teacher and principal participants attended the program from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. daily. The students were taught by a regular science teacher and attended classes for a half day daily. These student classes served to teach the new science programs to the students and also as a demonstration and tryout class for the teacher and principal participants. Special attention was given to the developmental psychology aspects of learning by elementary school students, especially as it pertains to science subjects, in instructions for the teacher and principal participants.

In addition, the teacher and principal participants had classes for the other half day where they learned skills, techniques, strategies, subject content, and became familiar with the materials of the program. They had lectures, seminars, laboratories, field trips, and special workshops with video tape analyses of the teaching styles that they had used in the demonstration classes. Participant teachers and principals had many field trips to science exhibits in the Washington, D. C. area.

There were no formal achievement measures of either the teacher and principal participants or the students.

3. Results

a. All 58 teacher and principal participants completed their training program successfully.

b. All 58 teacher and principal participants will be utilizing this Science Curriculum Improvement Study program in their schools in September 1970.

c. All 58 teacher and principal participants were adequately prepared and qualified to teach or plan the program. All participants expressed great interest and satisfaction with this innovative way to teach, how they themselves learned, and looked forward to implementing the new curriculum.

d. The classroom teacher felt that the 40 pupils had gained at least as much as they could have gained from any regular science course and, in fact, had learned more and with much more interest and enthusiasm. The teacher said that this was true for all 40 pupils.

e. There will be monthly follow-up studies of the teacher and principal participants, throughout the school year, to determine their capabilities and degrees of success with the new curriculum.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. The teacher and principal participants met their primary objectives to become qualified and prepared to teach the innovative science curriculum.

b. They had excellent experience-learning and practice teaching opportunities.

c. The students gained in subject information and science process skills as well as greater interest in learning about the sciences. Nearly all expressed a desire to continue their education in the sciences.

d. The monthly follow-up studies can be an extra strength for future staff development and program planning in the sciences.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Teacher and principal participants at first resisted the innovative methodologies. They especially were insecure with the "inquiry" approach of teaching mathematics as related to the program. But, eventually, they liked the approach and preferred it. Although a problem, this was a natural anticipated problem.

b. Many students, even though attending for only half a day, did not have adequate lunches.

3. Recommendations

a. This seems like an excellent program which combined good quality staff development, curricular innovations, and pupil instructions and has demonstrated success in all three areas. Its format might be considered as an exemplary model for other subject areas in Summer 1971. It should certainly be continued for the sciences next Summer.

b. Next Summer, good lunches should be available for all students in the program, without cost to them, even though they attend for only half a day and may go home afterwards.

c. The program was considered to be adequate in the amount of daily time and number of weeks duration.

CHAPTER 22

SCIENCE -- TIME, SPACE, AND MATTER

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Marylin Krupsaw

2. Location of Project: Federal City College

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

23 Students, in the 7th and 8th grades, from District of Columbia Junior High Schools
1 Director
1 Associate Director
1 Teacher
2 Laboratory Instructors
3 Guest Consultant-Lecturers
29 Teacher Participants

5. Cost: $800.00 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To prepare District of Columbia junior high school teachers in the use of an innovative and modern science curriculum. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science subject content, and to understand the developmental psychology aspects of teaching and learning science. Concurrently, to assist interested junior high school students in learning more about the earth sciences.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. This was a staff development program to qualify and prepare District of Columbia junior high school teachers to use a modern and innovative science curriculum program.

b. To acquaint the teachers with new skills, techniques of teaching science, and subject and curricula content.

c. To provide an intensive program in the earth sciences for interested junior high school students.

d. To review the developmental and psychological factors involved in teaching and learning science subjects.

2. Procedures

Twenty-three 7th and 8th grade students were selected from various District of Columbia junior high schools on the basis of their interest in learning more about the sciences and their parental consent. Twenty-nine teachers currently teaching in District of Columbia junior high schools were selected, one from each of 29 schools, on the basis of their interest in the program and qualifications for admittance to the Federal City College Graduate School. This later requirement was to enable the teachers to qualify for three graduate semester hours of credit for their participation in the program. The participating teachers were given stipends of $60.00 per week plus an additional $15.00 per week per dependent up to a maximum of four dependents.

The teacher participants attended the program from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. daily. The students were taught "Time, Space and Matter" by a regular science teacher and attended classes for a half day daily. The student class served to teach the new science program to the students and also as a demonstration and tryout class for the teacher participants. The developmental and psychological factors involved in learning science subjects, as it pertains to junior high school students, were reviewed by the teachers.

In addition the teacher participants had classes for the other half day where they learned skills, techniques, strategies, subject content, and became familiar with the materials of the program. They had lectures, seminars, laboratories, field trips, and special workshops with video tape analyses of their teaching styles in the demonstration classes. Participant teachers had many field trips to area science exhibits of the earth sciences including geology, astronomy, oceanography, meteorology, and local natural resources.

There were no formal achievement measures of either the teacher participants or students. The students received regular junior high school credit for this science course on the basis of their participation.

3. Results

a. All 29 teacher participants completed their training program successfully.

b. All 29 teacher participants will be utilizing this "Time, Space, and Matter" curriculum in their classrooms in September 1970.

c. All 29 teacher participants were adequately prepared and qualified to teach the program. They expressed great interest and satisfaction with the innovative ways to teach, how they themselves learned, and looked forward to implementing the new curriculum in September.

d. The classroom teacher felt that the 23 students had gained at least as much as they could have gained from any regular science course and, in fact, had learned more and with much more interest and enthusiasm. The teacher said that this was true for all 23 students.

e. There will be follow-up studies of the teacher participants, monthly, throughout the school year to determine their capabilities and degrees of success with the new curriculum.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. The teacher participants met their primary objectives to become qualified and prepared to teach the innovative science curriculum, "Time, Space, and Matter".

b. They had excellent experience-learning and practice teaching opportunities.

c. The students gained in subject information and science process skills as well as greater interest in learning about the earth sciences. Nearly all expressed a desire to continue their education in the sciences.

d. The students received regular junior high school credit for this science course on the basis of their participation.

e. The planned monthly follow-up studies can help future staff development and innovative curriculums in the sciences.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Transportation to and from Federal City College was difficult for many students in that they did not have carfare.

b. Many students, even though attending for only a half day, did not have adequate lunches.

c. Teacher participants at first resisted the innovative methodologies. They especially were insecure with the "inquiry" approach of teaching mathematics related to the program. But, eventually, they liked the approach and preferred it. Although a problem, this was a natural anticipated problem.

3. Recommendations

a. This seems like an excellent program to prepare junior high school teachers to use a new and innovative science curriculum. The successes of both teachers and students suggest consideration of this approach for other subject areas and certainly the continuance of this program in Summer 1971.

b. The costs of public transportation should be returned to all students who come to the program.

c. Next summer, good lunches should be available for all participating students, without cost to them, even though they attend for only half a day and may go home afterwards.

CHAPTER 23

SHARPE HEALTH SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED AND NON-HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Marian Siler

2. Location of Project: Sharpe Health School

3. Date Begun: June 15, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

85 Students, of ages 6 thru 19, from Powell Elementary, Macfarland Junior High, Roosevelt Senior High, and Sharpe Health School
1 Director
1 Principal*
12 Teachers
1 Resource Teacher*
1 Industrial Arts Teacher
1 Visual Arts Teacher
4 Teacher Aides
1 School Psychologist
1 Clinical Psychologist
1 Registered Nurse
2 Nursing Assistants
4 Physical Therapists*
2 Occupational Therapists*
5 Recreation Department Staff*
2 Neighborhood Youth Corps Aides

5. Cost: $5,300 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

---

*part-time with this program

B. PURPOSE

To provide "language experiences in reading" for physically disabled and non-disabled students to enrich their reading, comprehension, vocabulary, written and oral skills, and thought organization abilities. Also, to increase "child-initiated" interaction between disabled and non-disabled children.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide a "language experience approach" for students to develop reading and communications skills.

b. To encourage handicapped and non-handicapped students to relate to each other in natural, normal, and communicative ways in order to prepare them to accept each other in the regular schools and in the community.

c. To measure the effectiveness of two kinds of "teacher action" in the program and to determine whether a democratically structured classroom increases social interaction.

2. Procedures

Forty handicapped students from the Sharpe Health School and 45 non-disabled students from neighborhood schools were selected on the following bases:

a. Their reading level had to be at the regular grade or not more than four years behind in the case of secondary level students, and no more than two years behind at the elementary level. Non-readers were not accepted.

b. Students who needed extensive remedial or psychological help were not accepted.

c. Acceptance priority was given to Sharpe Health School students who were possible candidates for transfer to the regular schools.

Teachers met for three days before the six-week program began for purposes of orientation and program planning. The 85 students met daily from 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Free lunches were provided. Free transportation was available for all children who needed it.

Team teaching was utilized with two teachers, one from Sharpe and one from a regular school, and approximately 14 students per class. Half the students in each class were handicapped and the other half were not.

Instructions were focused upon communications skills with special attention to language experiences in reading, reading comprehension, vocabulary, written and oral skill development, and the ability to organize and express thoughts. Each class also had a "Club Period" for one hour daily to encourage social skills and interaction among all students. The students were reassigned to new "Clubs" every two weeks; however they stayed in the same academic classes the entire six weeks. Clubs were activity oriented. Activities included clubs for Games, Crafts, Shop, Sewing, Drama, Science, Clay, Story Telling Camera, Model Cars, and How to Give Parties. Students also went on field trips to such places as television stations, newspapers, the Smithsonian Institute and the Zoo.

There were six classes in this program. In two classes the teacher structured and determined the major decisions such as what to study, how to study, and how class activities would be scheduled. In these classes, students worked on individual learning projects. This approach was applied for the full six weeks. But it did not apply to the "Club Hour".

In the other four classes, the teacher encouraged students to make their own individual and group decisions about what to study, strategies to be used, and how class activities would be scheduled. Students were encouraged to develop and work in group projects and activities. This approach continued for the full six weeks. It did not apply to the "Club Hour".

Teachers had a choice of which approach would be assigned to their classes in keeping with their usual style of teaching. All teachers met daily for one hour to report on what happened in the class, plan the next day's program, and deal with any problems. The subject content and overall curricula were similar for both approaches to teaching. Students could not transfer from one class to another.

3. Results

a. Seventy-nine of the 85 students completed the program. Five of the six dropouts were non-disabled students. Most of them were older students who dropped out to get a summer job.

b. The teachers indicated that all 79 students who completed the program made significant gains in learning, especially in their interest to learn.

c. Fifty-two of the students were tested with the "Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test" before and after the program. This is an individually administered test which estimates intelligence by measuring vocabulary. All classes showed gains in mean scores by at least five IQ points. (The scores and ranges of this test are similar to the Wechsler tests; i.e., 90 to 110 is "Average Range".) The range of individual student score gains or losses were from -10 to +54 points; however, 41 of the 52 students made gains. Thus, 41 students measured vocabulary gains following the program.

d. Metropolitan Reading Tests were given before and after the program. These test results showed no significant average class gains.

e. Nearly all of the handicapped students demonstrated gains in social abilities with the non-handicapped as well as gains in the way they saw themselves as community citizens. The program seemed to help them to dispell any prejudices that they had regarding their abilities and their place in society.

f. Nearly all of the non-handicapped students demonstrated that they had learned that handicapped students are essentially individuals first, who happen to have a disability, but who also have valuable abilities as well as feelings, just like other individuals.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Students received good quality individual instructions and classroom attention with language enrichment experiences in reading.

b. There were evidences of positive gains in social interaction among the handicapped and non-handicapped students and with their teachers. Participants also showed evidences of positive attitudinal growth.

c. There was a high quality of teaching with a strong supporting professional service staff.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. The program planners did not know the amount of their Summer Enrichment funds until several days after the program started. This inhibited adequate planning.

b. Because teachers did not meet for orientation until three days before the program started, there was some difficulty in preparing the teachers to work with each other in the program. Earlier orientation would have given them more time to accomplish this before classes began.

c. Six students dropped out, four or five of them to take summer jobs.

d. Funds had to be borrowed from another vital program to pay for workbooks and other supplies for this program.

3. Recommendations

a. Funding should come early enough for adequate planning, staffing, and student selection. The director said that the latest adequate date would be in March and that the exact amount of funds that will be available should be specified.

b. There should be adequate funds for needed supplies, including special supplies that might be required for groups of students which include individuals with physical disabilities.

c. The mixing of handicapped and non-handicapped students might be considered for some regular classes on a year-round basis. It could help both handicapped and non-handicapped students to better understand and accept themselves as well as each other.

d. The real values of this program seem to lie in the good quality of instructions, individual attention, and the empathy and communicability that disabled and non-disabled students learned from each other. The study of "democratically structured" teacher action, as compared with more directive or autocratic teaching approaches, might better have been omitted from this program which has so many variables that were not and could not be accounted for or controlled.

However, if such a study had to be done it might have utilized a split-half technique whereby each class was taught by one method for half the time and the other method for the other half of the time utilizing teachers who were carefully prepared and qualified to teach each method. Then each student would have been his own "control", in that he would have been taught by both methods, and his accomplishments under each method could be compared. The "method" would have to be specified clearly and not merely labeled. An equal number of the classes would also have to have each method for the first and last halves. These and many other factors would have to be accounted for to warrant valid conclusions about the advantages of democratic versus autocratic methods. Requirements for the validity of such a study suggest that it would be better omitted from this otherwise excellent quality program for disabled and non-disabled students.

e. There <u>does</u> seem to be much need for a pertinent study which might be feasible for this program. Since a major objective of the Sharpe Health School is to help capable disabled students to return to the regular school system, it would be very desirable to know more about reducing the handicapping effects of disability which seem to inhibit the accomplishment of such a goal. If we think of the "disability" as the thing(s) physically or medically wrong with the person and the "handicaps" as the obstacles or barriers created by the disability, then which handicaps from each disability can be reduced and how can it best be accomplished? Why is it a fact that several students with the same degree of the same disability (e.g. four students with 10/200 vision or with impaired hearing) often have different kinds and degrees of (e.g. social, emotional, or learning) handicaps? What can be done to maximally help students who do poorly in overcoming such handicaps to do as well as other students who have the same disability? How much is due to the disability, to the handicaps, and to other factors and capacities?

CHAPTER 24

SMITHSONIAN ART WORKSHOP

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Marie B. Williams

2. Location of Project: Smithsonian Institute

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

62 Students from District of Columbia Junior and Senior High Schools
1 Director
3 Art Teachers from District of Columbia Junior High Schools
1 Art Teacher, part-time, from a District of Columbia Elementary School

5. Cost: $5,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The Summer Art Workshop held at the Smithsonian Institute was a six week program designed to give talented students special training in the use of art media. It was also designed to provide experiences in viewing the works of outstanding artists of past centuries as well as contemporary ones.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide enrichment activities in the visual arts for talented District of Columbia Public School students.

b. To give the students an opportunity to do studio work in various media, including: acryllic colors, water colors, magic markers (color), pen-ink, pencils, print making, and sculpturing.

c. To enable students to view outstanding works of art through field trips to the National Gallery of Art (specifically to observe thirteenth century paintings on wood).

d. To give students an opportunity to choose media they wish to work with and at the same time encourage them to experiment with a variety of media.

e. To provide walking and bus field trips within and outside the city for sketching and paintings.

f. To provide students with opportunities to view artists at work and to see behind the scenes at the Smithsonian with demonstrations by artists at work there.

g. To observe the development of display cases at the Smithsonian.

h. To give teachers an opportunity to work with talented students using various art media.

2. Procedures

Five hundred city-wide students made application for the workshop after it was announced. The announcement was made by circulating a flyer to the principals and art teachers in all public schools of Washington, D. C. Notices were sent to the parents of the 500 applicants. Parents of over 100 students returned their applications. The program had space for only 62 people. Senior high school students were selected first, then junior high students with selection based upon talent. Art teachers played a significant part in making recommendations of individual talented students for the summer workshop. The director stated that this procedure was used because the program was designed primarily for secondary students. Participating students represented schools from throughout the District of Columbia. Sixty-two students were selected and officially registered.

The staff included three regular junior high school art teachers and one part-time elementary school art teacher. Each staff member had worked in the program last summer and was selected on the basis of being able to work well with children in a museum setting. The director stated that the teachers had to be "structured" in the sense that they were well organized yet sufficiently flexible to create a free and nonrestrictive atmosphere within which the students would work.

Students attended from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. daily. They had instructional classes, studio practice, movie-slide programs, related field trips, and opportunities to visit with and observe local working artists. Students received free hot lunches and transportation.

3. Results

a. Students took related trips in and outside of the city; e.g. the Freer Gallery, the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the African Art Museum at Howard University.

b. Students visited the National Gallery of Art and expressed much interest.

c. Students met working artists and technicians in the field of art.

d. Students assisted behind the scenes and learned what work goes into shaping a display case for a museum.

e. Students had studio space and worked in a museum setting. They were permitted to sketch in the museum exhibit halls.

f. Students used various media in producing their own completed pieces of work.

g. Students gained insight and knowledge about art as a possible career.

h. Students created pieces of art work that they were able to keep or sell. Nearly all the students sold some of their art work and received as much as $50 and $75 for their work (e.g. acryllic paintings).

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Students learned about art and the world of the working artist, that art can be a gainful career.

b. Students received professional quality instructions from art teachers who were also working artists.

c. Students experienced an art program in which they were intensively interested and could create their own works with various visual arts media.

d. There was excellent rapport among students, teachers, the visited working artists, and museum personnel.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Four of the younger students were somewhat too immature for such a professionally oriented program.

b. Some students did not wish to lend their best work for exhibit because they were afraid that they would not get it back.

c. There were insufficient funds for enough art materials. Students did not have enough acryllic paints, brushes, sculpting plaster, and other items. Furthermore, two-thirds of the materials did not arrive until the third week of the program because funds had been cut.

3. Recommendations

a. Funding should be sufficient for adequate art supplies for this fine art program. An additional $750 would have solved this program's problems regarding insufficient supplies.

b. A closer rapport with and understanding of the students' feelings regarding why they did not want to exhibit their work could perhaps help students to better enjoy their creative efforts by exhibiting them.

c. This program should be considered for continuation on Saturdays throughout the year. The Smithsonian Institute has offered free studio space for this purpose and the director believes that at least 50 of the summer students would want to continue their art education.

CHAPTER 25

SMITHSONIAN SUMMER PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Miss Joy Covington

2. Location of Project: Smithsonian Institution

3. Date Begun: June 15, 1970 Date Completed: August 28, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

120 High School Students (juniors and seniors)
1 Director
1 Assistant Director
1 Museum-Community Coordinator
3 Volunteer Supervisors

5. Cost: $5,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

Smithsonian Institution resources provided information and education in the natural sciences and history, with related public speaking opportunities, for junior and senior high school students from District of Columbia high schools. These students had opportunities to help guide and instruct inner-city pupils and other visitors through the exhibits.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To help the 120 high school students learn as much as possible about the museum exhibits and resources.

b. To teach the 120 students how to guide and instruct groups of visitors in museum subjects. Visitors included groups of inner-city pupils.

c. To provide opportunities for the 120 students to meet with other persons from all over the United States, and the world, and to relate well and communicate with these persons in a teaching capacity.

d. To improve the quality and understanding of the exhibits for visitors to the museum by having these student guides available to help them.

2. Procedures

a. Approximately 200 applicants from all District of Columbia high schools, plus some from Maryland and Virginia high schools, applied. All were accepted; however, only 120 remained with the program.

b. For the first week, volunteer museum teachers provided lecture instructions, exhibit tours, and small group instructions for the students. Orientation and instructions in public relations were also included.

c. Then, in the second week, students began to conduct tours on their own. For example, each student, alone, took groups of from five to forty museum visitors on guided instructional tours.

d. The 120 students also acted as special instructional guides for approximately 500 inner-city pupils from the District of Columbia Public Schools.

e. Students also assisted with special interest visiting groups; they helped, for example, with films, special lectures, and detailed exhibit studies.

3. Results

a. The 120 high school students received instructions in museum subjects, learned the exhibits, and utilized the museum subject library and other resources.

b. The 120 students gained experience in teaching, meeting and relating to people from far away as well as from their own community. This included foreign visitors, other students, and sometimes even afforded opportunities to use their high school-learned languages.

c. Inner-city students seemed to gain interest in the museum exhibits as a result of being guided by their peers. This was especially true when Black pupils had Black student guides for the "Black Exhibits". The young visitors also seemed to be more interested because their guides were close to their own age.

d. The students seemed to grow in maturity and develop work responsibility as a result of participation. They seemed to gain as a result of helping the visitors and working for common goals. They demonstrated team effectiveness.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This was a voluntary interest and experience learning effort of students. They were not paid. Only transportation was provided.

b. Students learned museum content and operations, and what museums have to offer the public.

c. There was very high student morale throughout the program. They were punctual for their assignments. They seemed to gain maturity and increased ability to relate well to strangers.

d. They gained public relations and public speaking skills.

e. Visitors' interests in the museum were encouraged and enhanced by these young student guides.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. The 80 students who dropped out wasted program time in that they gradually dropped out, putting extra burdens on the 120 students who were really interested and completed the program.

b. Special tours for out-of-state groups were arranged by Congressmen's secretaries in the name of the Congressman. The students became excited with anticipation at the honor. Then frequently the group never showed up. This happened about three times a week all summer.

c. Museum guards did not understand the program, sometimes were suspicious of the student guides, and occasionally did not even want to let them in the museum.

3. Recommendations

a. The program seems to offer many values to interested high school students and should be repeated next summer.

b. Some screening procedures should be considered which omit students who are likely to drop out because of their limited interest. Two hundred students could have taken the program; therefore 80 places were wasted.

c. The program should be publicized early enough to attract more interested students for next summer.

d. Better liaison and understanding with regular museum personnel, especially the guards, seem necessary.

e. Better liaison and understanding, via public relations efforts, should also deal with problems like those caused by Congressional secretaries arranging for tour appointments that will not be kept.

f. Someone who worked closely with this program in Summer 1970 should be available, at least as a consultant, to whoever plans the program for Summer 1971. Many of the lessons learned about the program, e.g. about the guards, unkept appointments, and dropouts, were not learned until the program was underway or nearly over and should be made known to next year's program planners.

CHAPTER 26

SMR EDUCATION

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Mamie H. Lindo

2. Location of Project: Military Road School

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

30 Severely Mentally Retarded Pupils of ages 6 thru 10
8 Teachers
1 Professional Aide
1 Clerk Typist
1 Psychologist
3 Work Scholarship Students
3 Student Trainees

5. Cost: $10,000 from District of Columbia Public School Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide a summer enrichment program for Severely Mentally Retarded pupils in academic, social, and recreational activities. Physical development was included.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide a training program for Severely Mentally Retarded (SMR) children in socialization, perceptual and language development, creative arts, music, and motor development.

b. To provide a report which includes each child's psychological and physical examination, and summer school program evaluation, to the school that the child will attend in September.

c. To provide the child with as many enriching learning experiences as possible including field trips, classroom work, swimming, other activities and riding the school bus.

d. To enable the child to work with teams of teachers so that he can benefit from many teacher personalities and expertises.

2. Procedures

The 30 pupils in this program were in the District of Columbia Recreation Department Program for the Severely Retarded. They had never been to public school before. There are approximately 150 such children in the Recreation Department's program. The 30 in this program were selected according to the following criteria:

a. They had to be toilet trained.

b. They had to be ambulatory.

c. They had to be able to function in a group setting.

There were at least 20 additional SMR pupils who were also qualified and eligible. However, due to insufficient funds for staff, these additional pupils could not be accommodated.

The program took place from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. daily. The children had classes, called "learning centers", in groups of seven to eight children and two teachers assisted by one or two trainees. There were four areas of "academic" learning:

a. Socialization

b. Perceptual Development

c. Music and Creative Arts

d. Motor Development and Swimming

Film strips and related educational aids were utilized. There were also field trips, by bus, to such places as the Zoo, Rock Creek Park Nature Center, Goodwill Industries, MacDonald's Farm, Kennedy Playground, and fire department companies. The children also received free breakfast and lunches. They received free transportation to and from the program.

There were home visits to the parents of every child by various members of the SMR program staff. Also, there were weekly two hour parent meetings at the Military Road School. Parents were instructed in proper care, educational techniques, and home management factors important for the child.

Every child was seen by the psychologist and received psychological assessment. Every child also received a medical examination. At the end of the program a report on the accomplishments, capabilities, and suitability for regular school or other placement was sent to the child's regular school or other source of referral. The report included an educational plan for each child in keeping with his needs and capabilities.

3. Results

a. All 30 students completed the program with very few absences.

b. Seventeen students were referred to the District of Columbia Public School SMR program.

c. Three students were referred to the regular school kindergarten.

d. Two students were recommended for institutionalization.

e. Two students were referred for services for the severely disturbed.

f. One student was recommended for continuance in the Recreation Department Program because of gross immaturity.

g. Five students were referred for other special SMR services.

h. The parents' group had an average attendance of about eight parents. Those who attended indicated that they had learned more about, and gained greater acceptance of, their child's handicaps.

i. A detailed report on every child was sent to his regular school or other referral source.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This was an intensive enrichment program, with good professional staffing, to also correctly assess and refer the SMR students.

b. There was extensive and good personal involvement of the parents.

c. Detailed reports were sent in time to be used at each child's next school program.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. There was insufficient orientation and preparation of the program

staff because notice of funding did not come until two weeks before the program began, i.e. approximately June 8th. This also interfered with hiring of the best staff.

b. The program should have been longer; eight weeks would have enabled a better service program for the SMR students.

c. An additional 20 qualified and eligible SMR students were not taken because of insufficient staffing due to limited funds.

d. The director said that there should be a full-time physician and nurse on the program staff. She said that there should also be a full-time social worker and guidance counselor on the program staff and that the bus drivers should be assigned as Aides to the program so that they could remain at the field trips instead of just delivering the children. The director said that these children were so uneducated that they needed individual, ideally one-to-one, attention.

3. Recommendations

a. Funding should be for eight weeks instead of six.

b. Funding approval should come early enough for adequate staffing, planning, and staff preparation.

c. Sufficient funding should be available in summer 1971 to serve all qualified and eligible SMR students who need the program, i.e. probably at least 50 students.

d. Funding should enable the program to hire the professional staff that they need. However, the program director should carefully specify the need and proposed use of additional staff and justify the need for less than the current two pupils per staff member, if such a request is made.

e. Summer 1971 planning should include all necessary orientation and preparation to make the best coordinated use of such a highly qualified and specialized staff.

CHAPTER 27

SPECIAL EDUCATION

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Directors: Mrs. Geraldine Haynes, Mrs. Donna Zadnik (from Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind)

2. Location of Project: Magruder Elementary School and Mount Vernon Junior College

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

25 Students, of ages 5 thru 12, from Special Education and District of Columbia Public Schools
2 Directors (part-time)
4 Teachers from District of Columbia Public Schools
1 Braille Instructor from the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind
4 Teacher Aides from District of Columbia Public Schools
10 Teacher Aides from Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind
1 Psychologist (part-time)
1 Swimming Instructor (part-time)
1 Secretary (part-time)
4 Student Volunteers

5. Cost: $6,500 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds in a joint program with the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind.

B. PURPOSE

To provide visually impaired students with instructions in academic skills: in communications (Braille, large-print, recording), reading, and arithmetic; to provide field trips for cultural and educational experiences; to provide a comprehensive physical education and recreational program; and to provide certain ophthalmological evaluations as needed.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide a stimulating environment conducive to academic learning by visually impaired students.

b. To provide individualized instructions geared to the learning needs and style of each child.

c. To provide an intensive program of varied field trips to increase the students' abilities to become aware of and learn from their environment.

d. To provide a comprehensive physical education and recreation program.

e. To teach the students how to utilize their residual vision with maximal effectiveness.

f. To provide ophthalmological examinations and optical aid services and to relate them to each student's educational needs.

2. Procedures

This program was for blind and visually impaired students of ages five through twelve. Five students also had severely impaired hearing. One was also emotionally disturbed. Three students had severe learning problems; seven others were also retarded. One deaf-blind student also had mild cerebral palsy. The other eight students did not have outstanding secondary disabilities.

Announcements of this program were sent to the parents of all known visually impaired elementary school students in the District of Columbia Public Schools. The parents of 25 students completed applications and all were accepted. Two-way transportation was provided for all students with three buses assigned to the program all day. Before the program began, there was a three day workshop to prepare and orient the entire staff. Staff conferences were held daily during the six-week program.

All students attended the Magruder School from 9:00 a.m. until noon and were provided lunch at the school. They received instructions in reading, (Braille and large-print) writing, arithmetic, expressiveness, social studies, drama, music, dance, and a variety of art projects. The instructions were one-to-one part of the time and in small group classes the rest of the time. Individual attention and remedial instructions were incorporated into the daily program. A variety of resource and instructional materials were available to this program through the Developmental Center.

Field trips were scheduled to such places as local dairy and produce farms, a bottling company, the Naval Yard, museums, Oxen Hill Farm, the Zoo,

a newspaper, the White House, Washington Cathedral, Folk Life Festival, and radio and television stations. In all cases places were selected where the children could touch things, not just with their fingers but also with faces and arms and backs if they wished. Students were encouraged to experience with all of their senses, to utilize their residual vision if they had any, and to verbally describe aloud the exhibits and what they felt and thought. The following day, in classes at Magruder, the students were encouraged to express their field trip experiences verbally, in writing, poetry, and art, and in their own weekly newsletter.

After lunch each day, the recreational program took place at Mount Vernon Junior College. It included daily swimming and swimming instructions, tumbling, and games.

Individual records were kept of each student's classroom achievements. A report on each student's academic accomplishments, special needs and problems, and strategies which seemed to work successfully was prepared to be sent to the school that the child would attend in the fall. The ophthalmological examination and optical aid information were provided only for those visually impaired students with known impaired hearing. The psychologist provided counseling, testing, and evaluation services for students as needed. The social worker visited student homes when necessary; five were visited.

3. Results

a. Twenty-four of the 25 students completed the program. The family of the other one went on vacation.

b. Although formal assessments were not made, all 24 students seemed to make considerable academic gains with increased abilities in self-expressiveness and interpersonal relationships.

c. The field trips seemed to provide very positive and enriching experiences. It seemed to really "turn on" the students to gain much more from the environment than they ever experienced before they had this program.

d. Students made great gains in utilizing their residual vision and other senses for orientation and experience learning.

e. The ophthalmologist referred one child for corrective surgery. The optical aids clinic provided special lenses for one child. These services were also utilized to instruct the staff in proper lighting and print size. Parents were instructed about lighting and print size by a letter.

f. Reports were prepared, showing student achievements, needs, and methods used. The reports were sent to every student's teacher for the fall semester.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This program provided intensive individualized services to visually impaired and multiply disabled students. Field trips were an integral part of the program.

b. There was sufficient qualified staff for personal as well as remedial attention.

c. Metropolitan Washington area resources were well-utilized for the field trips.

d. A detailed report on each student's program and accomplishments was sent to the regular teacher of his fall semester school.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. It was difficult to coordinate the services of the 25 staff members because the two directors were available to the program only on part-time bases.

b. The part-time secretary had insufficient time for all that needed to be done.

c. None of the equipment or supplies ordered for this project ever arrived even though it was ordered through District of Columbia Public Schools in May. This included books, art materials, films, and recording tape. These items had to be borrowed from elsewhere.

d. The classrooms at Magruder were often too hot and humid for maximal learning.

e. There were no parent meetings and little participation.

3. Recommendations

a. There should be one full-time director of this program instead of two part-time directors.

b. A full-time secretary seems warranted.

c. The program should have the information about when to order supplies for delivery on time. If May is too late, this would have to be known as early as necessary.

d. All visually impaired children should have periodic audiometric examinations, as well as any needed otological examinations, in addition to their ophthmological examinations. Such information is essential to teaching visually impaired children to maximally utilize their senses. It is also

important for an understanding of the reasons for such problems as low achievement, poor orientation, and weak expressiveness. A teacher has to know the extent to which the student cannot hear or that impaired hearing is not a cause of the problem.

e. In summer 1971 this program should include plans to involve the parents in the enrichment activities of these visually impaired and multiply disabled students. It would be very desirable, perhaps essential for some students, to have parents also learn about such things as maximally utilizing residual vision and the other senses. The fact that students increased their awareness, abilities to understand the environment and relate to people and things, to learn academic and expressive skills, and to utilize their senses with generally greater effectiveness, all suggest that such learning opportunities had been missing in the past. Parents, and even siblings, should know about these things too and why they are so important to a visually impaired person. A letter -- such as was used to send the ophthalmologist's information about proper lighting and print size -- is not enough. Parents should be able to learn directly, perhaps in a series of scheduled group seminars for them.

f. Four Magruder classrooms should be air-conditioned for the 1971 summer program. Since they have up and down wooden windows, this might cost only about $300 per classroom for window units if the existing electrical wiring can be used.

CHAPTER 28

SPEECH AND HEARING

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Vivian Overton

2. Location of Project: Speech Clinics - Burroughs, Davis, Drew, Garrison, Gibbs, Kimball, Langston, McGogney, Meyer, Petworth, Powell, Savoy, Shadd, Takoma, Van Ness, and Watkins Elementary Schools. Hearing Clinics - Bowen, Grant, and Shadd Elementary Schools.

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

245 Students in all grade levels from District of Columbia Public Schools
1 Director
12 Speech Therapists
4 Aides
4 Drivers

5. Cost: $4,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of these clinics is to provide continuing therapy services for students referred by speech correctionists or hearing therapists, for students attending the regular summer school program who have been screened and found defective by a correctionist, and for students referred by principals or professionals in allied agencies.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

To provide speech and hearing therapy services for District of Columbia Public School students with the following problems: hard of hearing -- 32 students; foreign accent -- 9 students; stuttering -- 18 students; articulation -- 140 students; delayed speech and language -- 35 students; voice -- 10 students; and cleft palate -- one student.

2. Procedures

There were two parts to this program. One part, staffed with four speech therapists, served 32 students with hearing disabilities and related speech problems. The other part of the program, staffed with eight speech therapists, served 213 students who had speech problems not related to deafness, i.e., problems such as those related to stuttering, cleft palate, articulation, delayed speech development, and foreign accents.

The twelve speech and hearing therapists were employed to aid students from District of Columbia Public Schools in all sections of the city. They conducted a regular therapy program and were responsible for planning, organizing, the scheduling of students and clinics, recording case histories, diagnoses, keeping progress records, counseling, administering tests, and weekly staff discussions. Friday was reserved for workshops and in-service training for all therapists.

The classes for students with impaired hearing stressed speech and language, reading, and auditory training. In addition, bus transportation was provided for field trips to nearby swimming pools and educational resources such as the Zoo, Smithsonian Institute, MacDonald's Farm, Farmer's Market, Nature Center, the Frito-Lay Factory, the Washington Monument, and the U. S. Capitol Building. Lunch was provided for these students.

The 213 students whose speech problems were not related to deafness received services from eight speech therapists. They received individual or group speech therapy two days each week for approximately 30 minutes. Those with severe or multiple problems received longer therapy periods whenever possible. Special individual attention was given as needed.

3. Results

a. All 245 students completed the program.

b. Delayed speech and language and articulation were found to be the most prevalent problems.

c. Many parent conferences were held. This was greatly facilitated by the fact that many of the students were brought to the program by their parents.

d. Continuing therapy during the summer prevented lapses in speech progress which might otherwise have occurred over the summer vacation period.

e. The lighter summer case load permitted more intensive therapy than would be possible during the winter program. This also enabled more individual therapy for severe or multiple problems.

f. Summer students were more at ease and relaxed because they did not have to be concerned about missing other activities and classes. This relaxed atmosphere seemed to promote increased interest and learning.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This summer program enabled the continuation of needed services which should not be interrupted.

b. More intensive services and more individual attention were provided than would be possible during the regular school year.

c. The summer program encouraged a greater involvement of parents and their more direct contact with the therapists in jointly recognizing the students' speech problems.

d. The summer program enabled extra time for field trips where the therapists could learn more about the problems and needs of these students than is possible during the regular school year.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. The referral of students was not established early enough or well enough because of lacking liaison and communications between the Summer Speech and Hearing Program and the regular school year program.

b. Needed equipment and materials arrived too late for maximally effective use. This was caused by a lack of planning time and the fact that the director wasn't assigned to the program until June 22. For the same reasons therapists had to be hired at the last minute.

c. Although a half-day was adequate for the therapists and students, the director's half-time was inadequate for running the program.

3. Recommendations

a. Records of the District of Columbia Public Schools show that there are additional students who need such summer program services. Additional funds for staffing and earlier liaison could enable more of them to be included in 1971. The 1970 student-staff ratio was adequate.

b. Methods of referring students for this program should be improved.

(1) There should be pre-registration for this program in May at which time the therapist could explain the summer program to parents and update information on the records.

(2) An initial pre-registration letter should include a telephone number at which the therapist could be reached by parents who could not come to the school.

(3) A follow-up letter should be sent from Pupil Personnel Services to the parents and teachers of all referred students giving the location and exact dates of the Summer Speech and Hearing classes.

(4) Winter therapists should describe on the referral form to the summer program any therapy that the student received during the regular school year.

(5) Audiograms and other needed information should be included with the referrals.

c. The summer program director should be employed full-time and should be able to begin summer program preparations at least one week in advance of the first day of program operations.

d. All materials and equipment of the Speech and Hearing Center should be readily available to the summer therapists at the beginning of the summer program. Therapists should be notified of their employment early enough for good program planning.

e. The speech and hearing therapists should be included in the school directory of each summer school.

f. Funds should be allocated for at least two field trips for the non-deaf speech students.

CHAPTER 29

STAY PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mr. Ralph Jordan

2. Location of Project: Spingarn High School

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

1,811 Students and former students, age 16 to 21, of the Spingarn STAY High School Program

3 Guidance Counselors
1 Social Worker
1 Job Counselor

5. Cost: $6,956 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide part-time placement services for jobs during the school year, for students, of ages 16 to 21, to help them earn enough to continue school to graduation. These jobs were selected to also prepare the student for full-time employment after graduation. Also, to plan follow-up survey studies of participants in the program.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To locate and provide part-time jobs during the school year for STAY students who need to work in order to continue school.

b. To provide employment for the students that will relate to their contemplated future vocational careers.

c. To increase cooperative relationships between the school and sources of employment for its graduates.

d. To help students increase their self-understanding, especially in relation to the world of work, and how to effectively relate to other people, especially in vocational situations.

e. To encourage parents to understand and be a part of the vocational planning and goals of the students.

2. Procedures

The Spingarn STAY High School Program is for District of Columbia Public School dropouts or potential dropouts. It began in 1965. Graduates from this program receive a regular high school diploma.

One thousand eight hundred and eleven former students of this program were contacted by the professional staff of three guidance counselors, one social worker, and one job counselor. Contacts were made with every one of the students, in person or by telephone, sometimes at the school and sometimes at their home.

The students were told that jobs were available for them at which they could work part or full time and attend school part or full time. Also, they were told that the jobs related, at least indirectly, to the kinds of careers that they planned. Examples of such employment included the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company for telephone operators, including a training program with pay, Television Station WTOP for technicians, the National Educational Association for clerical aides, and the American Chemical Society for printing and clerical aides. In all of these job situations, the student received a competitive salary or at least the minimum wage for trainees.

These job opportunities were located by the staff of five during the second two weeks of the six-week program. The professional staff had the school records and other related information about every participant. The first two weeks were used to determine the academic and vocational abilities and needs of the students and to update their records. The last two weeks were used to match the students with the correct job opportunities, to evaluate the program, and to plan to study what happened to past participants in the STAY program.

Individual vocational counseling and group vocational guidance were provided for all students by the staff. Included were instructions in how to apply for a job, how to take job entrance examinations, how to dress, how to talk to a personnel interviewer, and how to fill out job application forms. The educational requirements and other details were explained for certain careers. Individual counseling was available for students with vocational-related educational problems.

3. Results

a. Sever hundred and fifty of the 1,811 students who were contacted had graduated from the STAY Program with a regular high school diploma. Many of them were already employed. Most of those who were not already employed, or continuing with higher education, expressed an interest in the offered job possibilities.

b. One hundred and forty-three job opportunities were located by the project staff.

c. All interested students were instructed in how to apply for the 143 jobs.

d. Many students were counseled regarding post high school educational opportunities and work-study programs.

e. Plans were made for follow-up studies of the accomplishments of the 1970 participants.

f. A study of students' services and accomplishments were scheduled to be completed during the 1970-71 school year.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. One thousand eight hundred and eleven STAY Program students received opportunities for vocational counseling guidance and career-related employment which could enable them to continue school.

b. This program provided needed year-round vocational services without interruption.

c. The staff was directly qualified for the tasks to be accomplished.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Because the staff was employed for only four hours daily, there was insufficient time per day, as well as in the length of the program, to fully accomplish all the objectives for the 1,811 students. This especially created problems in record keeping and home contacts.

b. Many of the participants did not have enough money for carfare to go to job interviews, for outside lunches, or for baby sitters in the case of young mothers.

3. Recommendations

a. There should be sufficient funds for the full-time employment of this program's staff in summer 1971. The program should also be extended to eight weeks if possible. The justification for both of these extensions is the great and pressing need to provide career-related employment for the students in time for them to work and continue their education when school begins in September.

b. In summer 1971 there should be sufficient professional staff to carry out all three functions of the program -- i.e., the determination of student vocational and educational needs, the location of career-related jobs, and student placement services -- full time in a six to eight week program.

c. Participants should be provided with transportation costs to job interviews and free lunches if possible.

d. It appeared that a major weakness in this program was the lack of adequate records. It was necessary for the five professional staff members to contact 1,811 students and former students to learn that 750 had already graduated with many of them already employed. This information might have been obtained clerically, and recorded in advance of June 22nd, to save the small professional staff about one-third of their contacting time. It might be helpful to have one additional staff person obtain this kind of information and another additional staff person begin to locate jobs in advance of the 1971 summer program.

CHAPTER 30

SUMMER CAMPING

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mr. Isaiah Green

2. Location of Project: Camp Round Meadow, Catoctin Mountain National Park, Thurmont, Maryland.

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: August 21, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

320 Students, 80 students in each of four sessions, from grades 4 thru 6 in District of Columbia Elementary Schools.
1 Camp Director
1 Assistant Camp Director
1 Curriculum Director
1 Arts and Crafts Director
1 Water Front Director
1 Recreation Director
4 Educational Specialists
1 Park Naturalist
1 Camp Nurse
1 Pupil Personnel Worker Community Aide
6 Camp Counselors

5. Cost: $25,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose was to enrich and enhance the educational experiences of pupils through the use of the resources of a natural environment utilizing actual experiences as available only in a camp setting. Also to provide opportunities for individual growth and development in a situation which promoted a total environmental philosophy relating man's human resources to his natural resources.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To extend the awareness of urban youth beyond the city environment into a natural environment, and acquaint the students with the natural beauty and historical resources of the Catoctin Park area.

b. To provide specialized training in reading skills.

c. To provide an opportunity to develop physical skills.

d. To provide recreational experiences available in an outdoor camp setting.

2. Procedures

The 320 students were referred by Title I and other schools and various District of Columbia agencies. Students were selected on the basis of being in grades four through six, parental approval, interest, and coming from low income areas. All applicants were required to take a medical examination.

There were four separate two-week camping sessions in the program. Each session had approximately 40 boys and 40 girls, housed in separate lodges, four to a room. This was a five day a week program. Buses took the students home for weekends and returned them to camp on Mondays. The staff met for one week of planning and orientation before the first session began.

All students were assigned to a daily half-day academic program which focused especially on developing reading skills. Also included were science, mathematics, social studies, and singing. The other half-day was for camping experiences which included hiking, fishing, overnight camping, and area field trips. Thus, the program scheduled a combination of the best aspects of camping and learning experiences.

Records of individual well being and academic, recreational, and other personal achievements were kept. Reading ability measurements (Botel Test Forms A & B) were made on the first and last days of each two-week session. Other individual abilities and needs were informally observed and considered for purposes of making the two-week experience maximally beneficial. Individual reports summarizing each child's needs and accomplishments were sent to the administrative offices of District of Columbia Public Schools for further follow-up considerations. These report forms included information and rating scales on each pupil's "General Attitude Toward Learning"; "Reading Ability"; "Interest in Math, Science, Social Studies, Arts and Crafts, and Music"; "Personality"; and "Camping Experiences and Contacts with Nature".

3. Results

a. Three hundred and twenty students completed the four programs lasting two weeks each.

b. The staff said that a large majority of the students demonstrated significant gains from the program, in academic, recreational, and developmental accomplishments.

c. Students demonstrated general gains in reading and verbal expressiveness.

d. The SRA reading program, "We Are Black", proved very valuable and highly interesting for all students.

e. A report on each student's achievements was sent to the District of Columbia Public Schools.

f. There was widespread and intensive student interest in spending more time in camp. Nearly all wanted to come back for more camping next year.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This program offered the first opportunity that most of the students ever had to experience camping. It served very poor inner-city children.

b. Camping and learning were related to each other in interest-provoking and fun situations. Students enjoyed academic achievements along with recreational and camping experiences.

c. Children had opportunities to think for themselves, independently, away from the home neighborhood, and learned to work together and develop personal and group responsibilities.

d. New communicative skills were learned with self-confidence.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Supplies did not arrive in time to be maximally utilized. For example, the science equipment did not arrive until four days before the entire program was over. Thus, three sessions did not get to use this equipment at all. Makeshift equipment had to be borrowed or improvised; this was not nearly as good as what was ordered.

b. Bus transportation was unreliable near the end of the program.

c. There were no reserve personnel for emergency situations. Thus when staff members became sick, no one was available to take their places.

d. There were no funds for clothing and toilet articles that some students needed.

3. Recommendations

a. It should be possible to arrange for needed supplies to arrive before the program begins. Learning opportunities, as well as money, were wasted.

b. The director said that it was definitely best for children to return home on weekends because it eliminated a laundry problem, homesickness problems, and possible dropout problems.

c. The director said that the two-week duration of each session seemed ideal.

d. There should be funds for additional emergency personnel who could cover for sick staff persons.

e. There should be funds for needed clothing and toilet articles that some students might not bring. Also, some of their families might not be able to afford to buy such articles.

f. The individual pupil records which were sent to the administrative office of District of Columbia Public Schools for follow-up study considerations would seem especially valuable in the hands of each pupil's regular teacher in September. The experiences and achievements of summer camping, as well as the academic accomplishments, especially in reading and expressiveness, could help the teacher to better understand and help the pupil.

g. Considering the great need for such experiences by inner-city students, this program might be considered for a ten-day session at the time of spring vacation.

CHAPTER 31

SUMMER LEARNING AND RECREATION PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Directors: Mr. Oscar Phillips, Mrs. Mary Wooten

2. Location of Project: Bryan and John Tyler Elementary Schools, Hine Junior High School

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: August 28, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

108 Students from all elementary and junior high school grades in District of Columbia Public Schools in the S.E. area.
1 Director
1 Coordinator
3 Teachers
2 Teacher Aides (paid college students)
3 Senior Youth Aides (paid high school students)

5. Cost: $7,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide a summer program of academic instructions and recreational activities, for elementary and junior high school students, with special emphasis on reading, self expression, and the development of interest in academic education.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide academic instructions in mathematics and reading and to stimulate student interest in school, books, and their neighborhood public libraries.

b. To provide studies in historical and contemporary Black culture and history.

c. To provide information about drug usage and effects.

d. To stimulate interest in self expression through poetry, creative writing, pantomime, and improvised plays.

2. Procedures

Students from the S.E. area of Washington, D. C. were referred by elementary and junior high school teachers and Recreation Department workers on the bases of:

a. Their interest in participating in the summer program.

b. Their need for remedial reading.

The 108 participating students met at the three schools from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. daily. Since the students were from local school neighborhoods, they walked to the program. Free lunches were provided. The staff included three teachers, two paid college students who were "Teacher Aides", and three paid high school students who were "Senior Youth Aides".

Students met in classes of 25 to 30 with team teaching by, for example, a teacher, a teacher aide, and a senior youth aide. Scheduled academic studies included reading, mathematics, literature, and Black culture and history. Students also wrote poetry and stories and improvised plays and pantomime. Outdoor sports activities, such as volley and soft ball, swimming, and arts and crafts were provided with District of Columbia Recreation Department facilities and materials from the Mayor's Youth Unit. Weekly field trips included instructive visits to the local fire department, the Naval Yard, Marine Barracks and cook-out picnics with instructions in barbecuing.

Records were not kept, and formal tests were not given in the academic subjects, to avoid a "required school atmosphere" connotation to the students.

3. Results

a. All 108 students completed the program; however, five of them were out for several weeks while on vacation. Daily attendance was approximately 80 percent of the total enrollment.

b. In the opinions of the teachers, all students improved their interest in the reading and other academic subjects and all made some progress in academic skills.

c. There was excellent attendance and peak interest in all the field trips and outdoor activities.

d. Permanent records were not kept and reports were not sent to the students' respective schools.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. The director felt that the informality, the fact that it was voluntary for the students, and the fun aspects were major strengths in stimulating student interest and reinforced their efforts and accomplishments in reading and self expression.

b. The program was local with pupils, the school, and field trips in neighborhood areas.

c. Students improved their desire and confidence, as well as skills, in expressing themselves.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Funding approval did not come until June. This was too late to adequately plan for the program.

b. None of the rooms were comfortable and some of the rooms were very inconducive to learning because of heat, humidity, and outside city noise. Air-conditioned rooms could have encouraged better student interest, attention, and academic work.

c. If more funds had enabled the hiring of more teachers, and there was more planning time, twice as many pupils could have been served; i.e. additional teachers and aides and buses were available to serve extra students.

d. A needed overhead projector was refused by this project because it would have arrived after the project was nearly over.

3. Recommendations

a. This seems like a much needed type of neighborhood program that is valuable but could be improved with added resources and planning time.

b. Simple, non-threatening, records should be kept of students' academic progress and these should be sent to each student's respective school in time to be used by his subject teacher in September. The report should show student levels of achievement, special needs, and successful methods which helped him.

c. Classrooms should be reasonably comfortable, quiet, and air-conditioned if possible to stimulate student attention, interest, and learning.

d. Supplies should arrive in time to be used. For example an overhead projector might be loaned for the summer from existing supplies in a school that is closed for the summer.

e. The program should be planned early enough to identify those interested students who need it the most. Funding approval would have to come much earlier, ideally by February.

CHAPTER 32

SUMMER MIDDLE SCHOOL, TRINITY COLLEGE

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Dr. Edward Duchorme

2. Location of Project: Trinity College

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

65 Students from grades 5 thru 12 from District of Columbia Public Schools
7 Teachers
3 Masters Degree Candidate Teachers
3 Bachelors Degree Student Teachers
1 Typing Teacher
1 Drama Teacher
1 Art Teacher
2 Group Activity Leaders
9 Student Assistants

5. Cost: $10,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project was to bring students, in grades five through twelve, and with varying backgrounds and talents, together and to provide them with concentrated academic activities.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To provide a concentrated enrichment curriculum in mathematics, history and language arts.

b. To provide remedial teaching in these subjects as needed.

c. To provide experiences, both in the classroom and on field trips, that would be personally and culturally enriching.

d. To provide a well-rounded recreational program including active sports, drama, art, and typing.

2. Procedures

Title I school counselors recommended students from low income families who needed the program, were interested, and had parental approval to attend regularly. There were no academic requirements, either high or low. Sixty-five students were selected from 100 who were recommended. They were given full tuition scholarships, worth $180, for a full-time program. They also received free hot lunches. There were insufficient funds to accept the other 35 students who were recommended.

The 65 students attended daily for six weeks. The first half of each day was scheduled to concentrate on academic studies in mathematics, history, English, reading, writing, and expressiveness. Seven experienced teachers, assisted by three Masters Degree candidates and three student teachers, taught academic classes to 198 students which included the 65 in the District of Columbia Summer Enrichment Program. Instructions took place in the Trinity College classrooms from 8:45 a.m. until 12:00 noon daily. After lunch, the program was scheduled for recreational and cultural activities. It included various sports, visual arts, drama, and typing. All students attended the academic classes for all subjects given. However special time and attention were given to individual needs, both remedial and accelerated.

The afternoon recreation program had a staff of one typing teacher, one drama teacher, one art teacher, two group leaders for recreational activities and nine senior high school and college student assistants. This afternoon staff taught 198 students which included the 65 in the Summer Enrichment Program. All students attended all afternoon activities with extra time for activities of their special interest.

The program included field trips to such places as the Smithsonian Folk Festival, Marshall Hall Amusement Park, a play at Shady Grove, a play at Arena Stage, special films, roller skating rink, and a family picnic. The trips were utilized to stimulate interest and expressiveness in the academic classes.

A personal letter was sent to each student's parents at the end of the program evaluating his work and listing his accomplishments. In addition, at the beginning and end of this summer program reading ability tests were given, but only to students who needed remedial reading. There was no identification of which reading test was used by the teacher. However, a report was

sent to the parents of every remedial student evaluating his reading accomplishments, in terms of reading grade levels before and after the program. Reports were not sent to the students' regular schools unless requested by the school.

3. Results

a. All 65 students successfully completed the program with very few absences.

b. Nearly all students made progress in one or more academic areas.

c. Nearly all remedial reading students showed grade level gains in reading comprehension and vocabulary.

d. The field trip experiences were well utilized in the academic classes.

e. Nearly all of the students expressed a strong desire to take this program next year. Many parents also requested this.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This program provided a combination of good quality academic instructions, remedial work as needed, and interest-provoking, enriching, recreational activities. The students' lunches were excellent.

b. The staff to pupil ratio was adequate for special individual and remedial attention.

c. The college setting seemed conducive to learning with pride.

d. Individual reports of accomplishment were sent to each student's parents.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. There were insufficient funds to provide scholarships for an additional 35 inner-city students who qualified, were interested, had parental support, and needed the program.

b. Some very poor inner-city children could not really afford the costs of public transportation to the program.

3. Recommendations

a. There should be sufficient funds to make this fine program available to all inner-city students who qualify and need it. The director said that 100 students can be taken in summer 1971 if there are sufficient funds.

b. Free public transportation arrangements should be provided as part of the scholarship for all Title I students.

c. Considering the importance of the subject, pre and post reading assessments should be given to all student participants in summer 1971.

d. A simple report of each student's accomplishments, or at least his academic ones, and the identification of any strategies which were especially helpful, should be sent to the student's regular school in time to be used in September.

CHAPTER 33

SUMMER VOCATIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Vera Dempsey

2. Location of Project: M. M. Washington School, Phelps Vocational School, and Chamberlain Vocational School.

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

300 Students, in 7th thru 10th grades, from District of Columbia Public Schools
1 Director
1 Principal
18 Teachers
6 School Guidance Counselors (two in each school)

5. Cost: $37,500 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project was to introduce students in the District of Columbia, particularly those who were not college bound, to the world of work and the possibilities of gainful employment.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To give each student an opportunity to learn about and have experiences in six different occupational areas.

b. To help students think about and plan realistically for skilled trade occupations which do not require college.

c. To provide educational, cultural, and enrichment activities for urban youth.

2. Procedures

Students were recruited through counselors in the junior and senior high schools. Selection was on the bases of student interest and parental approval. Three hundred students were selected and served by the project. Students of both sexes were accepted from grades seven through ten. Staff were selected who could teach the occupational courses that would be offered. To accomplish this, the director contacted selected principals to determine which teachers might be interested in teaching the program. These were currently employed teachers of the District of Columbia; therefore, no further certification was needed. Several teachers and counselors who worked with the program in previous years were invited to participate again. The staff in each school consisted of one principal, six teachers, and two counselors. There was a one-day general orientation meeting of all staff prior to the beginning of the program.

This program was designed as an experimental Summer Vocational Orientation Program for male and female students presently enrolled in grades seven, eight, nine, and ten in the junior and senior high schools. Students received experiences in six different occupational areas. They also received supplementary classes in occupational information and career orientation as well as counseling services. An effort was made to have the parent join the student and counselor in a discussion of the student's interests and abilities as demonstrated during the orientation program. Students attended daily from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Each school had a program of six different skilled occupations which do not require college. These were:

Chamberlain Vocational School (boys & girls)	Phelps Vocational School (boys)	M. M. Washington School (girls)
Advertising	Auto Repair	Clerk-Typist
Basic Electricity	Carpentry	Cosmetology
Clerk-Typist	Drafting	Dry Cleaning
Good Grooming	Landscaping	Health Occupations
Office Machine Operation	Shoe Repair	Nursery Assisting
Photography	Tailoring	Sewing

Most students selected their programs on the basis of which school was closest to where they lived, rather than because of courses offered. However, each of the school programs required every student to take all six courses, one week for each of the six occupations. The purpose of this was to acquaint students with six possible career areas, for them to consider, which do not require college. The purpose was <u>not</u> to teach the trade, or vocational

training as such, because any of the six occupations would require more than six weeks to prepare the student to enter employment; as a matter of fact, most of the occupations require two to three years. The major objective was to help students to think about and plan realistically for skilled trade possibilities which do not require college. They then could take related high school course work needed for their occupational choices. Students received one-half of a regular high school credit for participation.

Students took weekly field trips to locations where they could observe the studied occupations in operation. Also guest speakers from these occupations came to the schools to enable students to learn directly from persons skilled and successful in the occupational fields. Included were recent graduates who had successfully entered the occupations. Students also took field trips to area cultural resources such as the Smithsonian Institution and the Federal Aviation Agency.

3. Results

a. Two hundred sixty-five of the 300 students completed the program, learned about six occupations, and earned one-half of a high school credit.

b. All students who completed the program demonstrated that they knew more about the world of work and expressed an interest in preparing for a career.

c. Students had informative experiences in various vocational fields and could realistically consider more than one occupational choice.

d. There was high interest and good classroom morale among students and with the teachers. Many students brought in friends during the first week who registered and took the program.

e. There was considerable spontaneous interest expressed by students' parents who visited the program.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. A staff of regular day school teachers, experienced in selected trades, were available to orient and instruct students in occupational possibilities.

b. Supplementary vocational counseling and occupational information were provided.

c. Personal counseling services were available to students and parents.

d. Students learned about many realistic aspects of the world of work.

e. Students learned directly about the world of skilled work from field visits to the occupational locations and from guest speakers who had successful careers.

f. A wholesome free lunch was provided.

g. Free transportation was provided for students.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. The approval of funds did not come until April. This was too late for maximally effective staff recruitment and student selection. It also held up effective program planning and the ordering of supplies.

b. The lack of a year-round program coordinator caused ineffective student recruitment for the program.

c. Program planners did not have available any information about long term values of the program for previous years' participants.

3. Recommendations

a. This kind of vocational orientation program for non-college bound students is much needed in the District of Columbia and might be considered for expansion.

b. Program funds should be allocated earlier in order to permit more effective planning, staffing, and recruitment of students.

c. There should be year-round liaison of this program with the regular schools and a year-round coordinator for this program. (The coordinator could be assigned only part-time.) The coordinator should conduct scheduled follow-up studies of previous student participants to determine the values of the program, the occupational successes and problems of the students, and how each year's summer program might be strengthened to meet current student needs.

d. The director recommended that the program should be expanded to include interested sixth grade students.

e. This program might consider coordination with existing apprenticeship programs which are partially supported with District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program funds.

CHAPTER 34

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY WORKSHOPS FOR CAREERS IN THE ARTS

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Directors: Mr. Michael Malone, Miss Peggy Cooper

2. Location of Project: The George Washington University

3. Date Begun: June 29, 1970 Date Completed: August 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

170 Students from grades 8 thru 12; they may come from any District of Columbia Public School
2 Directors
15 Teachers
1 Secretary

5. Cost: $5,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the program was to provide talented public school students with skill, training, and exposure to the "Arts", particularly those students who because of limited economic resources were unable to gain meaningful training and other experiences on their own.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To establish a high school for the "Arts" in Washington, D. C. (This is a long-range plan.)

b. To give students professional training so that they will be equipped with the skills necessary to pursue a career in the arts.

c. To erase the fears and suppressions that Black students may have regarding the arts, to bring them in contact with professionals already in the field and to familiarize them with the degree of competency required for one to succeed in the arts.

d. To establish on a city-wide basis, a center where students can get a comprehensive "art education" until it can be phased into a public school.

e. To provide students with technical skill training in the arts, along with an appreciation of the arts, so that, for example, a student who fails as an actor would have other skills and qualifications for employment.

f. To help place students in advanced training, or jobs which provide opportunities for such training.

g. To concentrate upon training in order that participants will be prepared to perform in planned outlets, play productions, et cetera. (Ultimate goal is to pursue a career and therefore to utilize all professional skills related to that area.)

h. To encourage children who have had no previous training but who have interest and potential. (It was noted that the work is demanding and high motivation is required.)

i. To establish a liaison with other schools through which students can work and continue their training. Examples of some schools are: North Carolina School of Arts, Catholic University School of Drama, George Washington University Dance Department, Juilliard School of Music, University of Wisconsin, and other professional schools of art and dance.

2. Procedures

The George Washington University Workshops for Careers in the Arts was a summer training program in the arts. It provided training in creative expression through various art media. The workshops were divided into four departments. The Dance Workshop involved instructions in ballet, musical composition for dance and dance composition, improvisation, jazz, modern and free style dance. The Drama Workshop consisted of classes in vocal exercises, pantomime, improvisation, musical theatre, stage geography and mannerisms, and theatre history and movement. The students performed a number of scenes and musical numbers taken from Broadway and other musical shows. Through the Visual Arts Workshop, the art students gained experience in intensive classwork, manning exhibits, and visiting galleries. The Film Workshop had students work with 8mm and 16mm (B&W and color) media from beginning to completed film product. Because of the high equipment costs, this was the smallest workshop. But film students did study films, have lectures, and individual projects.

This program was designed for youngsters who had definite interests and talents in the arts. Procedures employed in the selection of students for the program were:

a. The director wrote letters to principals and guidance personnel of the public schools.

b. The director sent letters to parochial schools, welfare organizations, the Junior Village, and the Neighborhood Planning Council.

c. As a result of being notified of the program, more than 600 students expressed an interest in participating and returned applications. These were reviewed by the Director and his staff who asked 400 of the student applicants to audition; from that amount, 170 students were selected for the program.

d. The staff consisted of two directors, one of whom taught a dance class, 15 teachers and one secretary. They were selected in the following manner:

(1) Staff was recruited by sending letters to professional schools of art.

(2) Applicants were asked to submit detailed resumes in order to learn as much as possible about their background and experience.

(3) The director received over 60 applications for teaching positions. He personally interviewed and screened all applicants and selected 15 teachers for the program staff.

This program received a considerable amount of very favorable newspaper coverage and community support. A highlight of the program was the "Everyman" Street Theatre which scheduled ten performances on ten main street areas of Washington, D. C. Audiences participated, the local communities were favorably involved, and the police and other city officials cooperated.

3. Results

a. With the assistance of this project's placement services, every high school graduate who completed this 1970 Summer Program has been accepted in either an art school or college.

b. Students were taken to professional performances.

c. A trip was made to New York to visit and perform at Lincoln Center, Prospect Park, and Morningside Park.

d. Students were taken to professional companies to observe classes and rehearsals.

e. Students visited a number of art galleries.

f. Students exhibited work at the Corcoran Gallery of Art.

g. Students visited a Broadway show production.

h. Several students are dancing professionally.

i. One student has been selected to study and work as an apprentice with Sam Gilliam, one of the nation's leading artists.

j. Three students were given full scholarships to enroll in drama at George Washington University. One such scholarship winner of last year went on to the Juilliard School of Music, Theatre Department.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Every student in the 1970 Summer Program who had already graduated from high school has been accepted for higher art education in an art school or college.

b. Students with ability were recognized and given an opportunity to develop and continue their training.

c. The students were taught by and worked with professionally trained teachers who were also working artists.

d. The participating students were from varied economic and cultural backgrounds.

e. Thorough use was made of available learning resources.

f. Rapport between students and staff was excellent.

g. Local community neighborhoods were personally, pleasantly, and educationally involved with aspects of this workshop program.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. There was a lack of sufficient money for teachers' salaries, books, supplies, and production requirements, especially in film, theatre, and the visual arts.

b. There was a need to request donations from parents and other interested parties in order to keep the program in operation. It was a very time-consuming, as well as an undesirable requisite, to have to continually request donations for the students' activities.

c. Students expressed frustration that they would only be able to study and work intensively during the summer instead of all through the school year in a high school for the arts.

3. Recommendations

a. There should be a year-round academic and arts program in a District of Columbia high school for the arts. Such a school would be specially staffed and equipped for programs in the arts.

b. Additional funds should be appropriated in order to better meet the needs of talented students and eliminate the need for contribution solicitations.

c. Special scholarship funds should be available for very talented but poor students.

d. Plans should be made to develop a well-coordinated information and recruitment program to identify talented students for these workshops.

CHAPTER 35

URBAN COMMUNICATIONS AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mr. Lawrence Smith

2. Location of Project: American University

3. Date Begun: June 15, 1970 Date Completed: August 28, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

80 Sophomore, Junior, and Senior High School Students
1 Director
2 Instructors
2 Assistant Instructors
7 Student Aides
3 Television Technicians teaching equipment operations
1 Electrical Engineer

5. Cost: $10,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

To provide learning and experience opportunities for students in the fields of journalism and broadcasting with opportunities to demonstrate their skills and talents and continue their training in these fields.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To identify capable and willing senior high school students who are interested in a possible career in the fields of journalism or broadcasting.

b. To create an instructional and practical atmosphere in which these students might work which would encourage their continued interest in journalism or broadcasting.

c. To assist the students in receiving college admission and scholarships.

d. To provide skill training in writing and oral communications as well as opportunities to learn about the design and production of a newspaper or the field of professional broadcasting.

e. To provide the journalism students with an opportunity to create a product. To provide specific experience in producing two issues of a newspaper, "Black Expression", which turned out to be a polished and completed publication highlighting the articles written by the workshop students and reflecting their journalistic skills as well as format and design capabilities.

f. To provide the students of broadcasting with instructions and experience in radio, television, video taping, and filming, and demonstration opportunities in a workshop setting.

g. To provide future placement services for students with talent; this applied to approximately the upper quarter of the class.

2. Procedures

This program consisted of two four-week courses, one in creative journalism and one in broadcasting, based on the assumption that an effective way to learn how to do something is by doing it. The workshop was conducted by the College of Continuing Education and the Communications Department at The American University. Intensive instructions in writing news stories, leads, features, and interviews, as well as detailed photography instructions, were given. There were field trips to newspapers, and individual assignments to district courts, art festivals and other places where stories would be covered by professional newsmen.

a. Eighty high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors from 12 Washington, D. C. high schools participated actively in the project. This included students from every high school in the District of Columbia.

b. One hundred-fifty students applied for the program. Eighty were selected, after individual interviews, on the bases of their interest, undeveloped talent potential and lacking opportunities for self-expression in the past. Student applicants who seemed to already possess outstanding talent were not invited to this summer enrichment program; i.e. they did not qualify because "they were already enriched". However, they were invited to other opportunities to study journalism and broadcasting in September.

c. The accepted students were provided with approximately twenty working days of a combined didactic and clinical experience in the design and production of a newspaper or the various phases of broadcasting.

d. The hours of the workshop were 9:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m. with some students working extra time.

e. Field trips were taken to local newspapers, and individual assignments were completed at district courts, art festivals and other selected places.

f. The students were given guidance and direction regarding how to make astute observations, how to identify and filter out the most salient dimensions of the events and activities which they observed, and how to take rapid and cogent notes so that they could be translated into comprehensive and interesting articles for publication. Intensive instructions with opportunities to learn by doing were also given to the students in the broadcasting course.

g. Lunches and transportation were provided to all students, and Title I students (i.e. very low family income) were also given $1.60 per hour (about $48.00 per week) to make up for what they would have earned if they had summer jobs.

3. Results

a. A product of the journalism workshop was two issues of "Black Expression", a realization of the project's main objectives and a tribute to the students who produced it. The participants gathered all the news that appeared in the paper -- wrote and edited it, composed leads for the stories and captions for the pictures which they took themselves. They discovered the art of makeup, of fitting stories and pictures in the space of a newspaper page, and saw the work printed and come rolling off a commercial press, a finished, readable newspaper.

b. The broadcast workshop produced three radio productions, three television shows, three films (8mm B&W, 10 min.), and three videotapes (about 12 minutes each) of varied subject matter.

c. The broadcast students improvised stories, wrote their own scripts, and edited their productions.

d. Twelve senior high school students held summer jobs made available by placement assistance.

e. Students selected six top level speakers, some from the industries of journalism and broadcasting and some from the community. They later interviewed them. Public service, regulatory agency, and community needs experts, as well as industry executives, were also interviewed by the students.

f. A "Career Day" program focused on current and future career opportunities in journalism and broadcasting.

g. An awards banquet, with nine award plaques for outstanding student accomplishments, was held at the end of the summer. School officials and outstanding speakers participated.

h. A "Workshop Policy Board" was established with high level representation from journalism and broadcasting. They advised this program and will help plan for future programs.

i. Students who completed the program received one-half of a high school credit.

j. Seventy-two of the 80 students completed the program and received their one-half high school credit.

k. The U. S. Information Agency and the Voice of America will utilize broadcast tapes from the summer program. WRC network television and WTTG covered the program in their news broadcasts. Students will also produce a weekly radio program for Radio Station WMOB.

l. Students from this program can continue their studies of journalism and broadcasting during the regular school year program.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Students with latent talent in these fields were given a first opportunity to develop their capacities and learn about career possibilities.

b. The students earned justifiable pride and self-esteem, in an educational setting, as a result of their journalistic and broadcasting accomplishments. They received warranted recognition for their newspaper, films, videotapes, radio and television shows.

c. Low-income, talented Black students from inner-city Washington received an opportunity for instructions at The American University.

d. Good liaison and relations among the students in this program, and with the University, were established and show promise of continuing in the future.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Insufficient publicizing of this program in the schools did not inform students of its existence and made recruitment difficult. This was especially true for students who had had school problems despite latent talent.

b. There were insufficient funds for a longer program. Each program should have been eight weeks instead of four.

c. There were insufficient funds to accept all qualified student applicants. An additional 20 qualified applicants could have been accepted.

d. Although there was only one White student, there was only one Black instructor. This suggests the logic of more qualified White students and more qualified Black instructors.

e. Funds had to be borrowed because the $10,000 from District of Columbia Public Schools was not received until after the program was completed.

3. Recommendations

a. This excellent program should be continued year-round as part of regular District of Columbia Public School instructions available at all high schools.

b. Additional funds should be provided to enable each course to extend for eight weeks. It should then be considered for a full (1) high school credit.

c. Funds should be made available to the program before it begins. The $10,000 was not received until after the program was completed.

d. Better publicizing of the program could result in more qualified White students and Black instructors.

CHAPTER 36

WEBSTER GIRLS' SCHOOL

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Helen Mason

2. Location of Project: Webster Girls' School

3. Date Begun: June 22, 1970 Date Completed: July 31, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

75 Students, pregnant school-age girls, from any private or public school in the District of Columbia
1 School Guidance Counselor
6 Teachers
2 Teacher Aides
1 Registered Nurse
1 Community Aide

5. Cost: $9,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

This program was designed to enable pregnant school-age girls to continue their education while awaiting delivery of their child and to encourage them to complete their high school education after the birth of the child.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To help the girls keep up with the required school curriculum while awaiting the birth of their child.

b. To provide prenatal care and instructions.

c. To provide needed social service help for the girls and their parents.

d. To provide psychological help when necessary.

2. Procedures

Seventy-five pregnant school-age girls, self-referred or school referred, were accepted in the summer program. There were no economic requirements. All eligible referrals were accepted. Students paid for their own transportation and lunches.

The girls attended academic classes, in keeping with their regular school levels, for four hours daily. Necessary school records on each girl came to the program directly from her regular school. The 75 girls were taught by six teachers assisted by two teacher aides. This small number of students per instructor enabled much more individual attention, and remedial work when needed, than would be possible in the regular District of Columbia Public School program.

Students also received class instructions in prenatal care and had scheduled weekly clinic visits with the physician. Instructions included health, nutrition, anatomy and physiology, infant and child care, and family living. Girls could continue their instructions and services after the delivery of their child and until they resumed their regular school program.

The staff school guidance counselor provided direct services for all students and referred girls for additional psychological help when needed. Social workers were available for services to the girl, or her parents, as needed at the school or in the home. Girls could continue their Webster Summer Program right up to the day of delivery. All girls were required to be pre-registered to receive obstetrical services at an area hospital when needed. Liaison was also established with the local Public Health Clinic.

After delivery, the girls are encouraged to resume their education at Webster School as soon as possible and to continue until they can return to their regular school.

3. Results

a. Seventy of the 75 students completed their summer program; i.e. or attended classes up to the time of their delivery.

b. The average attendance was 60 students per day.

c. The director said that most of those who did not attend might have attended if it were not so unbearably hot and transportation so difficult. The combination of heat, humidity, and public transportation problems were often just too much for a girl in late pregnancy.

d. The girls who stayed at home did not receive home instructions because there were no home teachers due to the lack of funds.

e. Many girls did not continue their educational program at Webster after delivery because of the reasons listed above.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. This excellent program continues essential services which cannot be postponed for the summer.

b. This program prevented or reduced many of the problems related to school-age maternity that would otherwise have fallen upon the shoulders of the young girls and their parents.

c. Good liaison with area resources were coordinated to help the girls before and after the delivery.

d. The girls were given every assistance possible to continue their education without interruption.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. Attendance and academic achievement were not nearly as high as they could have been because of lacking air conditioning in the students' classrooms. (The entire building, which is very old, has no air conditioning whatsoever, even though window units might do the job.)

b. Due to the lack of home visiting teachers, girls who needed academic instructions at home could not receive them.

c. Many of the girls could not afford adequate lunches.

3. Recommendations

a. The classrooms for these school-age pregnant girls should be air-conditioned. Window units would probably be adequate. The approximate cost might be no more than $300 per classroom, including installation, using the existing electrical outlets. At least six classrooms should be so equipped for summer 1971.

b. In summer 1971, this program should include funds for two home visiting teachers to provide instructions for girls who have delivered or who are physically unable to travel to the school.

c. The costs of transportation and free lunches should be provided for all girls who attend the Webster School Program.

d. The recommended items of air conditioning and lunches, as well as maximal attendance at this instructional program, could greatly enhance the girls' physical health, and their infants' health, as well as their academic achievements.

e. The possibility of an air-conditioned infant nursery, to enable girls to attend the program after delivery, should be considered. Girls could take turns in caring for the infants and attend classes. This could be combined with their instructions in correct infant care.

CHAPTER 37

WIDENING HORIZONS

A. SUMMARY DATA

1. Director: Mrs. Evelyn H. Letcher

2. Location of Project: Eighty-four field tour locations throughout the Washington, D. C. Metropolitan Area

3. Date Begun: June 24, 1970 Date Completed: August 7, 1970

4. Number and Type of Participants:

6,000 Students from District of Columbia Junior and Senior High Schools
1,500 Students from District of Columbia Elementary Schools
1 Director
3 Vocational Aides
1 Secretary
250 Volunteers (parents and other interested individuals)

5. Cost: $5,000 from District of Columbia Public School Summer Enrichment Program Funds.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project was to provide cultural stimulation for inner-city children through field trips and, especially, to provide them with curriculum enrichment and practical vocational experiences.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. Objectives

a. To impart information about areas of employment that may be considered in making a vocational choice.

b. To stimulate the vocational motivation of students through tours which offer opportunities to study and discuss occupations in the Washington area.

c. To provide curriculum enrichment experiences that can extend pupil learning and classroom activities.

d. To provide meaningful experiences which will encourage the pupil to want to continue his education.

e. To provide information about the city and its recreational facilities for leisure time use.

f. To expose youth to cultural institutions and experiences such as art galleries, museums, theatres and concerts.

g. To develop an awareness on the part of youth that people in other communities in the greater metropolitan area are interested in children and youth throughout the city.

2. Procedures

The project served approximately 7,500 students. Some were enrolled for the summer in various junior and senior high schools; others were from the community. There were no criteria for students to participate in the program. Various centers throughout the city were selected to serve as pick up stations for students wanting to go on certain tours.

Widening Horizon's Tours for Teens was administered by the Urban Service Corps of the District of Columbia Public Schools with the aid of a volunteer community committee. Government agencies and private institutions cooperated by providing programs and opening their facilities to the 1,500 elementary and 6,000 secondary school students. These tours were designed to provide inner-city children with a variety of cultural experiences based on their interests and age levels. The program was further designed to aid students' oral and written expressiveness. In class, the teachers encouraged children to express themselves, orally and in writing, regarding their tour experiences. In addition, the program offered opportunities to explore different kinds of job opportunities in the Washington Area.

Generally the age level of the children determined the type and nature of the tours; however, the interest and course content of the students were also factors.

Teachers employed in the summer school program attended many of the tours and provided background and follow-up information. Hundreds of volunteers also participated; they arranged trips with the agencies, recruited youngsters from the community, and chaperoned the tours.

The program enabled students to go on various trips and see many centers of interest in the city. They were introduced to a variety of resources for recreation and entertainment. Students also received

information about occupations available in the city and gained experience in completing job applications and taking various tests required for different jobs. Many students indicated an interest in employment opportunities and sought detailed information concerning educational requirements for the jobs. It was believed that this aspect demonstrated to students the value of continuing their education, and increased their outlook for future employment opportunities.

Cultural experiences were also gained from the tours. Students from all over the District of Columbia visited many institutions and learned about the contributions made in the arts by different peoples and races. Students seemed to appreciate the personnel who took time to explain different components of their agencies, as well as job opportunities and occupations, and seemed sincerely concerned with them as individuals.

Tours included: the African Museum of Art, a Coast Guard Cutter, National Zoological Park, fishing, Andrews Air Force Base, National Historical Park, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., Great Falls, Md., the White House, John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company, Smithsonian Institution, Goddard Space Flight Center, D. C. Courts, U. S. Civil Service Commission, Howard University Schools of Medicine and Nursing, WTTG Television Station, Department of Agriculture, Beltsville Agriculture Experiment Station, World Health Organization, National Institutes of Health, D. C. General Hospital, National Bureau of Standards, Department of State, Treasury Department, and the National Science Foundation.

3. Results

a. These field tours provided experiences for inner-city students that they would not normally have had.

b. The tours provided enriching experiences which enhanced their summer learning programs.

c. Students were made aware of occupations available in Washington, D. C., the requirements and preparation needed, and what such employment had to offer.

d. Students gained insight into the advantages and disadvantages of various occupations.

D. EVALUATION

1. Major Strengths

a. Students had opportunities to experience many centers of interest in the city. This provided resources for learning and personal enrichment.

b. The tours, in general, motivated students to consider a variety of jobs and occupational fields.

c. Students not planning to attend college were given valuable information concerning employment alternatives.

d. There were many evidences that students' oral and written expressiveness were improved as a result of the tours.

e. The students were well received at the various exhibits, agencies, and departments. The personnel genuinely welcomed them and truly tried to make the tour experiences pleasant as well as educational.

2. Limitations and Problems Encountered

a. The scheduled buses didn't always arrive on time. This disrupted schedules and created time as well as morale problems.

b. Voluntary community coordinators sometimes sent the wrong age group for the tours; e.g. six year olds for a teenage tour.

c. Especially on the longer trips, students could have used a good lunch.

3. Recommendations

a. There should be better liaison and program understanding by the voluntary community coordinators who scheduled students for the trips. They had a one day orientation meeting; additional program orientation was needed to avoid errors like sending six year olds for a teenage field trip.

b. Lunches should be available for all students who want it, even though they are in the program for only a part of a day.

c. An effort should be made to include (older) students in the planning of field tours for next year's program.

d. Bus contracts might include a money penalty clause for excessive lateness of scheduled buses.

PART THREE

AN OVERVIEW AND EVALUATION OF ALL THE SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

		PAGE
CHAPTER 38.	OUTSTANDING PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND STRENGTHS	163
	Voluntary Participation	163
	Unique Learning Opportunities	163
	Individual Attention.	164
	Innovative Teaching, Staffing, and Community Involvement. . . .	164
	Cultural Growth and the Prestige of Education	165
	Jobs and the World of Work.	166
	Enriching Academic Achievement.	166
	Why These Programs Should Take Place in the Summer.	167
CHAPTER 39.	PROGRAM LIMITATIONS AND PROBLEMS.	168
	Waste	168
	Responsibility.	168
	Insufficient Funds.	170
	Insufficient Time	170
	Free Lunches and Transportation	171
	Student Solicitors and "Begging".	171
	Insufficient Recognition for Excellence	171
	A Negative Learning Climate	172
	Clerical Help	174
	Reports	174
	Follow-up and Liaison	176
	Program Self-Evaluation	177
CHAPTER 40.	EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS, RESEARCH AND INNOVATION	179
	Illustration of an Exemplary Program.	179
	Other Exemplary Programs.	180
	Exemplary Aspects of Programs	182
	Research and Innovation	183
CHAPTER 41.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS	185

CHAPTER 38

OUTSTANDING PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND STRENGTHS

Voluntary Participation

Any consideration of Summer Enrichment Program accomplishments should include the fact that 21,555 students attended voluntarily. Although there was undoubtedly a variety of motivations, reasons, and influencing factors, including teachers' recommendations, seeking something fun to do, or even just "taking a look" to see what a program was like, the students attended because they wanted to attend. This is quite an accomplishment for programs seeking to attract students who have just completed a full academic year of compulsory education. It was perhaps an amazing accomplishment considering that most of the programs, which were planned for poor children in a hot dirty city, nevertheless, took place in hot humid buildings in that same hot dirty city! (There were some exceptions such as the camping program, some field trips, and a few air-conditioned classrooms.)

Attendance was generally good; for some programs it was much better than the record for regular compulsory school. Many of the programs, as described in the preceding chapters, had more qualified student applicants than they could accept. Thus the programs should be commended for arousing and keeping student interest in educational enrichment.

Unique Learning Opportunities

The Summer Enrichment Programs offered students many opportunities to learn what they could not ordinarily study in regular school. This included career considerations such as the programs in journalism and broadcasting at American University. Several summer programs offered instructions in the fine arts from working professional artists in studio settings. A camping program included indirect education in group living, peer relationships and responsibilities. African culture and language were taught intensively as valid and important educational fields. There were professional instructions in concert music and improvisational theatre.

Students learned how to be guides and conduct tours for other students, as well as visiting dignitaries, at the Smithsonian Institute. Paid apprenticeships offered training by experts and experience in skilled science occupations. Supervised trips related to culture, education, and recreation included the Lincoln Center in New York City as well as the wealth

of field resources in metropolitan Washington, D.C. Most of the programs encouraged pupils to express their own ideas and feelings about their learning experiences, to let others know what they think, and to learn actively rather than only passively.

Individual Attention

Most of the Summer Enrichment Programs provided more individual attention, smaller classes, and intensive instructions than are feasible during the regular school year. To a large extent, this was made possible by the use of para-professionals, parent aides, student aides, and volunteers. This in turn permitted more remedial, tutorial, and counseling services as well as opportunities to identify important student needs.

Team teaching was frequently well used with good rapport among students, teachers, and the teaching assistants. Often one-to-one attention was possible in an informal atmosphere that could get to the core of problem causes and essential goals. Parents were available to and actively participated in many of the programs. Homes were visited by program staff aides more easily, less formally, and probably with less anxiety than would be the case during the regular school year. Many of the programs reported apparent gains in student self-confidence, with greater willingness and ability to communicate, following such individual recognition and attention. Some of the programs referred this information to the summer students' respective regular teachers so that they could build upon such gains.

In a few cases the participating teaching assistants went on to plan future careers in teaching or, as in the case of the "Community Reading Assistants" of the Anacostia Projects, became employed as full time para-professionals in the fall semester.

Innovative Teaching, Staffing, and Community Involvement

The Summer Enrichment Programs offered, as they should, opportunities to try out, develop, and refine promising teaching approaches and strategies. Most of the programs should be commended for taking reasonable and responsible advantage of the opportunity. The D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra had an outstanding program with amazing results which will be discussed in the chapter on exemplary programs. Nearly all of the programs made good use of high school, college, and older teaching assistants, para-professionals, community volunteers, and/or parents. Some of these people were paid and some were not paid. For example, the Anacostia Projects utilized 50 paid junior and senior high school students; Widening Horizons, with a paid staff of only five, used 250 volunteer parents and interested individuals to operate their tour program for 7,500 students; and 48 of the 106 classroom teachers in the Primary Summer Schools also acted as "Head Teachers" for the program.

Many of the programs, such as the Model School Division at Seaton, utilized open classrooms, team teaching, and flexible programming to meet individual student needs. Some of the programs, such as the Model School Division at Bruce, included classroom education for parents as well as active parent participation in the enrichment program for students.

New curricula were developed in the three science programs with teacher and principal orientation, strategy refinement, didactic classroom experience, and teacher preparation to teach three new science courses in the 1970-71 academic year. The George Washington University Workshops for Careers in the Arts visited and performed in New York, exhibited at the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and received high praise and recognition from several newspapers for their series of ten Street Theatre performances, with audience participation, at ten main street areas in Washington, D.C. Many of the programs utilized professionals who were willing to teach (e.g. the arts or at Goddard Space Center) during the summer but could not leave their work the rest of the year.

Cultural Growth and the Prestige of Education

A large number of Summer Enrichment Programs made outstanding use of the many cultural and educational resources in metropolitan Washington, D.C. These programs offered cultural discoveries and growth, and elevated the prestige and status of education in the eyes of the summer program students. The scores of excellent field trips incorporated into the programs are described in their respective chapters. Most noteworthy are those programs which related the field experiences to students' academic work and encouraged the relationships through student self-expression.

The program at the beautiful Trinity College setting mixed 65 Title I pupils with approximately twice that number of students from private schools in order to help all the students to learn about each other and the larger world. At St. Albans 36 inner-city pupils shared their Summer Enrichment Program with twice as many pupils from other cultures, socio-economic levels, nationalities, and even other cities. The Summer Enrichment Program at Georgetown University enabled 50 high school students to live in a university dormitory while taking intensive college preparatory academic work. Being treated as pre-college candidates encouraged the students to see themselves as college-bound and to try to achieve in keeping with their maximal potential. Being able to study at a university undoubtedly also had positive influences on, for example, the arts, journalism, broadcasting, science, and college orientation students at George Washington, American, Howard, and Catholic Universities, and D.C. Teachers and Federal City Colleges. The same kind of positive influences were also increased by the location of programs at the Smithsonian Institute and the Goddard Space Center.

Jobs and the World of Work

Many of the Summer Enrichment Programs provided outstanding opportunities for students to learn about specific vocational careers, fields of employment, and, perhaps most important, the advantages as well as responsibilities of the world of work. These programs should be generally commended for their efforts to be practical and reality oriented.

The Summer Vocational Orientation Program provided 300 students who were not college-bound with a survey of six different skilled occupations which do not require college. Three such courses, with a total of 18 occupations, enabled students to consider the various vocational areas, participate in career discussions, receive vocational guidance as needed, and earn half a high school credit for the course.

The Goddard Space Center Program offered 38 one-to-one student apprenticeships, in various technical skills, with 38 department supervisors at the Goddard Space Center, and paid the students $1.40 per hour for their work. This will be discussed further in the chapter on exemplary programs. The STAY Program offered to help find jobs for 1,811 students and former students to enable them to continue their education. The Pupil Personnel Summer Dropout Program contacted 1,326 of 1,885 students who had dropped out of school to offer vocational guidance, educational counseling, and referral for related services.

The various Summer Enrichment Programs employed 59 student Neighborhood Youth Corps Workers, 93 high school student aides, 23 parent aides, and a large number of college students. Besides the earning of needed money, these aides generally gained by learning valuable skills, how to relate to others at work, and to effectively carry out job responsibilities.

In addition to the several programs which focused directly upon vocations, most of the other programs encouraged students to consider the vocational aspects of their experiences and to see the world of work with a positive outlook.

Enriching Academic Achievement

While nearly all of the Summer Enrichment Programs had some academic aspects, many of them included intensive instructions in reading, mathematics, science, writing and oral expressive skills, and, in a few programs, college preparation for underachieving students with college potential. Many programs found it helpful to divide their time with academic instructions followed by, or alternated on different days with, recreational activities or interesting field trips. The latter were especially helpful where the trip experiences could be incorporated in the classroom activities.

The most desirable location for the college preparation programs seemed to be at local colleges or universities. A college setting seemed

conducive to learning with pride and maturity. Some of these programs were very intensive, yet maintained good attendance.

Why These Programs Should Take Place in the Summer

Several of the Summer Enrichment Programs could not really wait until regular school would begin in September. This seemed especially true of the two Pupil Personnel programs. The Child and Youth Study Summer Program provided individual assessment and evaluation services needed in September before the student could be properly placed in class, recommended for remedial or special instructions, or be referred elsewhere. The Summer Dropout Program, if it would help students return to school or consider vocational training, obviously had to be accomplished before September.

Even more obviously, the Webster Girls' School Program to enable pregnant school-age girls to continue their education while awaiting and after the delivery of their baby could not wait until September. It was as important as the actual academic education during the summer for the girls to know that educators wanted to help them, when they needed help, and would teach them how to care for their infants as well as to achieve a a high school diploma.

The STAY Program often had to help students find jobs before September to enable them to continue school at all.

The Special Education, Speech and Hearing, SMR, and Sharpe Health School programs had to utilize the valuable summer time to help their disabled or multiply-disabled students become ready to get the most out of the academic year.

The Summer Camping, Widening Horizons, Smithsonian, Goddard, the several college preparation, and the arts programs, as well as most of the others not mentioned, also could not take place during the academic year.

The fact of the matter is that nearly all, or possibly all, of the 35 Summer Enrichment Programs fall into one of two categories:

(1) Those that could not wait until school would begin in September.

(2) Those that could only take place during the summer.

This report recognizes that many Summer Enrichment Program improvements are possible, and these will be discussed critically in the next chapters. However, this report does find that nearly all of the Summer Enrichment Programs either could not wait until after the summer or could only take place during the summer.

CHAPTER 39

PROGRAM LIMITATIONS AND PROBLEMS

Waste

The greatest cause of waste and the most frequent cause of major program problems was the late and unpredictable approval of funding. Planners did not know for how much their Summer Enrichment Programs would be funded, or whether their programs would be funded at all, until late in May, or in June, or in some cases even after the starting date of the program!

This made it very difficult, in many cases, to effectively recruit or hire qualified staff for the programs. Many qualified people who were interested in the Summer Enrichment Programs took other jobs because they couldn't take a chance on having no summer job at all. For most of the programs there was not nearly enough time to adequately orient and prepare the staff who were hired at the last minute. To make matters worse, the last minute recruitments precluded having the staff participate in program and curriculum planning.

Supplies could not be ordered on time. Some programs did not receive their supplies until it was too late to use them. Some supplies arrived after the summer programs were completed.

These problems involved 21 of the 35 Summer Enrichment Programs. Some of the program directors said that the late approval of funding also precluded effective attempts to remedy insufficient funding. It put a few program planners in the ridiculous position of trying to seek additional funds for their programs without being able to tell the potential sponsors how much they needed or if the program would exist at all.

In Table 1, the late funding problems of the 21 programs affected are summarized and listed by their respective chapters.

Responsibility

An additional factor is lost with late funding approval and that is the matter of responsibility. Surely the Summer Enrichment Program planners and directors should be held responsible and accountable for hiring qualified staff, for good program and staff preparation, for proper student selection, and for making sure that supplies do arrive on time.

TABLE 1. A SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROBLEMS CAUSED BY LATE FUNDING APPROVAL OF THE 1970 SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

See Program Described in Chapter	Program Director Said Funding Approval Was Not Known Until	Late Funding Caused Inadequate Time to: Recruit Staff	Plan Program-Prepare Staff	Get Supplies On Time	Other
3	"end of May"		X		
4	"May"			X	
5	"July 1st"	X	X	X	
6	"June 29th"	X	X	X	
7	"planning was too late"			X	
8	(too late)				Students had to solicit funds
9	(too late)		X		Had to borrow emergency funds from Georgetown University
11	"late May"	X	X	X	Not enough time to recruit the most qualified students
12	"last moment"	X			Not enough time to inform principals and community about the program
13	"too late"		X	X	
14	"late in June"	X	X	X	
15	"June 15th"	X	X	X	Not enough time for student selection
19	"too late"		X		To attract more Title I students
23	"several days after the program started"		X		Not enough time for student selection. Funds had to be borrowed.
24	(too late)			X	Funds were cut
26	"Approximately June 8th"	X	X		
28	"Director was assigned on June 22nd"	X	X	X	Inadequate student referral -- also due to poor liaison with regular school programs
30	(too late)			X	Supplies should have been ordered very far in advance of summer
31	"June"		X	X	
33	"April"	X	X	X	Inadequate student selection
35	"Funds arrived after program was completed"		X		Funds had to be borrowed

How they will go about this, as well as program evaluation strategies, should be spelled out in advance before programs are approved. The effective carrying out of these program necessities are responsibilities that should not escape via valid excuses that the program never got started properly because of late funding approval.

Insufficient Funds

Although most programs could have made good use of additional funds, it was the lateness of funding approval rather than the amount of money which caused their problems. However there were a number of programs which were seriously hurt because they were given insufficient funds as described in the individual program chapters. Some of these programs could have achieved major gains with a relatively small amount of additional money.

For example, 62 students in the Smithsonian Art Workshop did not have enough acryllic paints, brushes, sculpting plaster, and other supplies which could have been purchased for $750. The Goddard Space Center Program had insufficient funds to provide available apprenticeships for an additional 76 qualified students. The D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra had insufficient instruments and the ones they did have were of poor quality. The Primary Summer School Programs lacked sufficient funds for teacher aides to assist with essential individualized instructions. The Summer Camping Program needed limited funds for emergency personnel and to provide needed toilet articles for very poor students. The Summer Learning and Recreation Program could have served twice the number of students if funds were available for additional teachers. Because of a lack of funds, the Trinity College Summer Middle School had to turn away 35 qualified inner-city students who wanted the concentrated academic program. The Urban Communications Program at American University had to turn away 20 qualified students who wanted to study journalism and broadcasting, and teach the accepted students for only four weeks instead of the needed eight weeks, because of insufficient funds.

Insufficient Time

Related to insufficient funds, several of the Summer Enrichment Programs needed longer study days or longer duration of their programs. For example, because of the lack of time, the Cultural Arts Program could only partially fulfill its objectives despite the fine quality of the program. The teachers at Bruce found their half-days too short. The SMR Education Program for the retarded needed eight weeks. The professional staff of the STAY Program should have had full time to serve 1,811 students. Because of the special needs they serve, three programs should be parts of 52 week, year-round, programs. These are the Child and Youth Study Program which provides assessment services, the Summer Dropout Program, and the Webster Girls' School Program.

It seems desirable to enable programs which logically need longer learning days, or a greater number of weeks, to have the necessary additional time. The extra cost, usually only for staff and supplies, would only be nominal compared to the total program costs and could enable objectives to be completely achieved.

Free Lunches and Transportation

While most of the programs provided free lunches and transportation for students, others did not. Because it is impossible for teachers to know which students will get a good lunch at home -- whether they are very poor or not -- all students attending Summer Enrichment Programs, even for half a day, should have available a tasty nutritious lunch. For some students, this may be the most nutritious meal of the day.

Some programs did not provide for free transportation to and from the program. Since this might keep poor students from the programs, such costs should be provided for all students. When parents are requested to come for special services, or to participate in the program, their public transportation costs should be reimbursed, if possible, for the same reasons.

Student Solicitors and "Begging"

Several of the programs had students solicit funds. They were encouraged to or asked to request funds from their parents, friends, and strangers. While the intent and the goals of such solicitations may be laudable, the method is not. This report specifically recommends against having students raise funds for District of Columbia Summer Enrichment Programs. This also includes the "selling" of things for such fund raising purposes. Students should not have to spend their learning time or fun time seeking funds. It is also a very inefficient way to plan a program and invariably ends up with programs continuing from day to day instead of according to well thought out plans.

If a program director wishes to seek funds from a number of public or private agencies or individuals, that seems highly commendable. Multiple funding is a part of reality. But it should be accomplished long before the program begins. The program director owes his best thinking time to his students after the program begins. And, as already pointed out, effective planning is nearly impossible if fund raising takes place concurrently with the program.

Insufficient Recognition for Excellence

A major deficit, although probably less so than in the regular school programs, generally, was the lack of adequate recognition for

exemplary quality. There was lots of attention to remedial accomplishment, to catching up with norms, and even to staying out of trouble. And these are very very important goals which deserve lots of attention.

But there is also the other end of the scale, the goals that it is hoped the upper 50 percent of students will try to attain. There should be rewards as well as recognition for achieving better than average; such goals should be made as attractive and desirable as possible because they should be the goals of all students.

There are just as many students in the upper 50 percent as in the lower 50 percent of accomplishment. Yet nearly all of our extra resources, monies, and sympathies are channeled to the lower 50 percent. Surely most of the rewards seem to lie with that half. There are many more offerings to the below average student to reach the average than for the average student to achieve higher; and nearly or absolutely nothing extra awaits the good student to achieve excellence. In the long run such policies can be devastating. In the short run, they are discriminatory.

Why not have medals, monies, scholarships, or trips to Europe for outstanding District of Columbia students? How about 60 awards for the 60 highest achieving students, ten in each of six subject areas -- say in Engligh, mathematics, sciences, foreign language, industrial arts, and the fine arts. The awards, all equal, could be a one month summer educational tour of Europe or Africa. It would cost only a fraction of the price of materials for some of the remedial programs.

A Negative Learning Climate

A major learning obstacle for students in many of the Summer Enrichment Programs was the nearly unbearable heat and humidity of Washington, D.C. The old school buildings didn't help matters and neither did uncomfortable teachers in that same climate. When it was very hot and classroom windows were wide open, the enticing sounds of competing street play and the distracting noises of car horns and truck motors added to the oozing perspiration.

Although the teachers and programs deserve credit for stimulating student interest sufficiently for them to attend, there can be no doubt that students learned less, achieved less, and enjoyed it less than would be the case in a more tolerable environment. Students on vacation who elect summer enrichment learning should not have to tolerate ordeals; neither should their teachers.

It seemed very unreasonable to expect, for example, the 1,153 elementary school and 402 junior high students of the Basic Community School Program or the 2,237 Kindergarten through third grade pupils in the Primary Summer Schools to achieve maximal academic enrichment, to learn to read better, and to gain educational motivation in such a learning climate. It seemed unfair to expect them to use the summer enrichment libraries that were open for them. It seemed cruel to offer

the 75 pregnant school-age girls desparately needed services in a building that made them feel sick when, out of the window, they could look across the street and see an air-conditioned pet shop.

In the District of Columbia, funds are very limited; but so is a student's learning time. And lost student learning time can eventually cost the community more than the price of air conditioning -- in addition to what it costs the student.

The problem of an uncomfortable learning climate in most of the public schools is not restricted to Summer Enrichment Programs. The obstacles of heat, humidity, city pollution, and street noises retard learning for some of the time in nearly all District of Columbia Public School programs.

In the District of Columbia non-air-conditioned classrooms are often unbearable for about three months of the year and frequently uncomfortable for another three months. That means that for one-half of every year millions of dollars of school resources are not being used for maximal learning effectiveness. If anyone has any doubts, they might consider what a difference air conditioning makes in governmental office buildings in the same city. Furthermore, employees have money incentives to be there. Children have play incentives to not be there. Is it any surprise that attention as well as interest would dissipate for children on a hot humid day in the spring, summer, or fall?

But if classrooms and libraries were cool and comfortable for students, and teachers too, what a catalyst for attention, interest, and learning! Than a good curriculum in the hands of a good teacher could really do its job, helped by the learning environment instead of fighting it.

All future school buildings should include good air conditioning. All existing buildings should be considered for the addition of air conditioning which should be installed as expeditiously as possible. Where only limited air conditioning can be installed, it should be installed in the classrooms first -- not in the administrative offices as was true in a few places in summer 1970. Schools which absolutely cannot be air-conditioned, for electrical or other reasons, should not be used for summer programs.

In cases where the only available space for Summer Enrichment Programs is an old school building, the number of classrooms actually needed should be equipped with window air conditioners. Such conditioners retail for about $250 and are easily installed since most of these school buildings have wooden framed up-and-down windows. However it may be necessary to add special wiring where the buildings are very old.

These recommendations in 1970 may sound like pie-in-the-sky priorities; but they are as valid as the fact that students have more right to air conditioning for the purpose of learning under comfortable conditions than city officials have to air conditioning for the purpose of discussing, for example, why students are not learning enough. In the

matter of priorities, the selection of other District of Columbia candidates for air conditioning should be weighed against the importance of pupil learning.

Clerical Help

Many of the programs lacked sufficient clerical help. This especially caused problems in record keeping, report sending, and communications with the community. For example, the Cultural Arts Program had one secretary for 1,027 students and 52 staff members. The D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra had one administrative aide for 1,139 students. The teachers of the Primary Summer Schools had no clerical services or teacher aides for 2,237 pupils. The STAY Program staff of five professionals had no clerical help for placement services for 1,811 students. Widening Horizons had one staff secretary for 7,500 students and, despite the good help of 250 volunteers, six year olds were sent for a teenage tour.

Grossly insufficient clerical help doesn't save anything. Rather it directly wastes professional time and indirectly wastes money and program efficiency. When a highly trained, higher paid, professional does necessary clerical work because no one else is available to do it, the professional time that should be given to students, as well as the higher salary, are wasted.

Several programs successfully employed high school students for clerical services as described in the individual chapters. This seems like an excellent idea to help both the programs and the students. It is recommended that future Summer Enrichment Program budgets should include funds for this purpose. Such employment possibilities for older high school students should be announced in all District of Columbia high schools, by May 1st at the latest, so that interested students can apply.

Several programs successfully utilized the services of student and adult volunteers. Although this can work out well, it sometimes leads to weak responsibility and usually requires more professional supervision than is required for paid services. However, especially in the case of volunteer parents, it can have side advantages in terms of the adult participation.

Reports

Many of the Summer Enrichment Programs significantly limited their good accomplishments by not having or not sending information about student achievements to the regular school that the pupil would attend in September. This was especially serious in the case of remedial subjects.

If a student made good achievement in, say, remedial reading and certain strategies or materials worked well, the teacher who will have the student in September should want to know. If certain strategies or materials

did not work well, the regular teacher should want that information too. The student's time and teacher's time should not be wasted in covering the same ground; and sometimes, with a full schedule, there is not even time to cover the same ground. Yet many of the academic and remedial programs, as indicated in their respective chapters, did not send this vital kind of information to their students' next teachers. For some programs it appeared as though summer enrichment responsibilities ended on July 31st, as though summer teachers and directors didn't care enough to think ahead to what could really best help their students. The result in such cases was that pupils might not gain as much as possible from their achievements and, incidentally, Summer Enrichment Programs did not receive all the credit they deserved because much of their pupil accomplishments went unknown.

The few Summer Enrichment Programs that did send adequate reports of pupil accomplishments, in time to be used when regular school would resume in September, certainly deserve praise. For example, the Primary Summer Schools Program sent a pupil achievement report, with individualized details about the 2,237 pupils in the summer program, to each pupil's regular school in time to be used by his teacher in September 1970. The Gonzaga Summer School Higher Achievement Project sent a report on the accomplishments of each student in time to be used in fall 1970. The two Pupil Personnel programs sent a complete report to every student's respective school by August 5th. The SMR Education and the Special Education programs sent detailed reports to each child's next program teacher showing pupil needs, achievements, and methods used.

One program sent reports to its pupils' parents but not to the regular school. Another program sent reports of student program achievements to a central administrative office of the public schools for future research possibilities, but not to the schools that the pupils would attend. Most programs sent nothing; some had nothing to send because they kept no records.

A few of the program directors said that they preferred an informal atmosphere and flexibility -- as though informality and flexibility were precluded by simple records to let the regular school reading or mathematics teacher know how the pupil learned best and achieved best, what strategies, materials, and approaches worked well, which ones didn't work well, and important pupil needs that might require special attention.

Future Summer Enrichment Program planners should include in their proposals the kinds of student achievement and other data that will be sent to the students' regular schools; or, the proposal should specify why this is not applicable or should not be done. In the case of critical academic subjects, such as reading, mathematics, and English, it would be especially helpful to have the reported information in some format which is compatible for all related summer programs. This could help determine which program approaches are most advantageous for which kinds of student needs.

Follow-up and Liaison

The success of many Summer Enrichment Programs hinged upon what would actually happen to their students during the coming academic year. However only a few of these programs prepared follow-up studies to determine such results, even if only to help plan the following year's Summer Enrichment Programs. Accordingly, such program improvement possibilities were generally lost. For example, it would have been valuable to have follow-up information on the Anacostia Project's important program to prepare 105 "Community Reading Assistants" for G.S. 3 and 4 level paraprofessional teaching positions. What will be their strengths, weaknesses, successes, and problems during their first year? Such information would be vital for staff development and planning future programs. Follow-up studies of this kind should be planned in advance, i.e., before the summer program begins, and should be included in the program proposal as an evaluation consideration.

A few of the Summer Enrichment Programs did plan follow-up studies. The Summer Dropout and the STAY programs planned to follow the progress of students served. The Georgetown University College Orientation Program planned to continue their limited study of students who entered college. Three programs should be especially complimented for their follow-up planning: The Introductory Physical Science, Science Curriculum Improvement Study, and Time, Space, and Matter programs, which had major teacher preparation objectives, planned monthly follow-up studies of the teacher participants, throughout the school year, to determine their capabilities and degrees of success.

Although limited funds for professional staff time, insufficient clerical help, not enough program time, and last minute rushing because of late funding were all contributing reasons for the seriously inadequate reporting and follow-up, there was yet another reason that was at least as important. It was the reason of insufficient continuity of responsibility. Equal to the mad scramble to hire staff and get started by June 22nd was the mad scramble to leave the programs on July 31st. When the programs ended, few staff persons were available to relate them to the regular school programs. It was often as though the summer enrichment students had been to another state or country for their programs with no reports, few records, and absent liaison.

It would be highly desirable to have more Summer Enrichment Program staff available to help relate these programs to the total academic school year. This liaison, in turn, should be spelled out in the proposals for Summer Enrichment Programs before they are approved for funding. Closer relationships between the Summer Enrichment Programs and the regular school programs could facilitate improved staff, student, and curriculum selections, continuity, and program evaluation considerations. Also, wherever warranted, regular junior and senior high school credits should be given to students for completed Summer Enrichment Program work.

Program Self-Evaluation

Most of the Summer Enrichment Programs were very weak in or lacked objective self-evaluation information. This is not at all surprising since most of the programs also did not have a clear-cut program plan to show their objectives or procedures. Without precise statements of what the program hoped to accomplish, and how they proposed to accomplish it, there could be no evaluation plan.

Such information was frequently "more or less" available, and staff persons were busy doing what they thought best, but nevertheless it had not been spelled out in writing.

Usually the reasons that program directors gave for lacking written plans was the lateness of funding, the resultant last minute confusion, or the desire for "flexibility". So, to a large extent, many of the programs seemed to "fly by the seat of their pants" and di[illegible] surprisingly well but not nearly as well as they might have done with careful planning or even a carefully planned "flexible" program.

It is strongly emphasized that all programs can be helped, and no program will be hurt, by well thought out written plans. It is perfectly valid, as well as reputable, to have flexible plans, plans for informality, and indicated unknowns to be developed later or on the basis of interim results. As a matter of fact flexibility, informality, and in-process planning can be greatly strengthened by good plans.

But it is inexcusable to proceed with a program, in a limited budget city of very poor children who have extreme educational needs, unless all the good thinking that can take place has taken place.

Proposals for future Summer Enrichment Programs should clearly specify what is to be accomplished and how it will be attempted, which procedures are known and what is yet unknown, what results are hoped for and how program strengths and weaknesses in terms of pupil achievement will be identified.

There does not have to be any highly technical evaluation procedures, statistics, or even language. For example, how many of a college preparation program's students were accepted by a college; why were the others refused; and how did those accepted stand after the first year? If 750 pupils are in a $61,000 program to upgrade their reading abilities and interest, what was achieved at the end of the program? If 1,153 students attend a program to provide interesting and enriching academic values, how were they enriched? If only 50 of 282 students in a recreation program attended daily, what were the competitors which won the other 232 students; what could have made them want to attend this program? If 150 teachers and [illegible]5 teacher aides instructed 500 students with a variety of approaches, which approach best helped which kinds of student needs; which learning experiences showed the greatest promise to enhance which achievements? If 108 students are provided academic instructions and recreational activities by three regular teachers, two paid college student teacher aides,

and three paid high school teacher aides, what were the most valuable contributions from each instructional source in terms of student gains; how can such teachers and aides be utilized to best help students in future programs?

Program planners should specify how they will evaluate the essence of their objectives not only to identify program effectiveness, in terms of student accomplishment and unmet needs, but also to identify what works well and what doesn't work. This is essential if future programs are to improve, build upon past discoveries, and not repeat previous errors.

CHAPTER 40

EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS, RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Since one of the purposes of having the 35 Summer Enrichment Programs was to explore and try out innovative ways of teaching which showed promise, exemplary aspects of programs as well as exemplary programs should be considered for replication in summer 1971, for incorporation into the regular schools, or for expansion in future summer programs.

A few of the 1970 Summer Enrichment Programs were exemplary as total programs. Many of the 1970 programs had aspects which were exemplary in pupil achievement, educational effectiveness, or the serving of special student needs, even though there were also some concurrent program weaknesses. And, unfortunately, several of the programs seemed to have exemplary aspects which were lost because records were not kept or seemingly successful teaching innovations were not documented. As stated previously in this report and referred to in the respective program chapters, such losses seemed like inexcusable planning and responsibility weaknesses.

Illustration of an Exemplary Program

The District of Columbia Youth Symphony Orchestra Summer Enrichment Program had three objectives:

A. To provide 1,139 interested students with good quality music instructions and performance opportunities.

B. To provide the D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra with professional quality instructions, rehearsals, and preparation to represent the United States at the International Festival of Youth Orchestras in Switzerland.

C. To offer advanced music students opportunities for relevant summer employment.

The program staff selected students solely on the basis of their interest in learning music. Students were approximately representative of the District of Columbia with regard to cultural and socio-economic factors. The program was held in hot, humid, totally inadequate space with bad acoustics. The available space sometimes was dirty, had interruptive noises, and students had to worry about being chased out by the janitor, e.g., in the middle of a Beethoven rehearsal, because doors had to be locked or rooms vacated. Instruments were of very poor quality and insufficient in number. Essential recording equipment was unavailable.

Details of the procedures are included in the chapter which describes the program. However the following results illustrate a truly exemplary program in spite of very difficult conditions.

1. The 1,139 students, in grades 2 through 12, received their choice of instrument and were given instructions by 44 professional musician-teachers, who specialized in the instrument taught, at a cost of 42¢ per student-hour of instructions.

2. The daily program was completed by 1,134 students with a 99.6 percent attendance record. They planned to continue voluntarily every Saturday during the coming academic year as did the 1969 Summer Enrichment Program students.

3. The 130 students in the D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra completed their preparation, gave a successful concert at Watergate, and went to Switzerland to represent the United States in competition with ten selected youth orchestras from eight countries. They planned to meet twice weekly during the coming academic year.

4. Eighteen advanced students in the program were employed as aides. They earned $56.10 per week to assist the program, keep records, give out instruments, and help teach other students.

5. In Switzerland, 30 of the students in the D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra were chosen for the International Orchestra thus winning for the United States 25 percent of the 120 seats awarded to students from all nations. In addition, a 17 year old cellist in the D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra was awarded one of the three scholarships to study in Europe for a year. The BBC made a film of the students' trip which was shown on U.S. national television, and Von Karajan invited them to play in Berlin in 1972. Washington, D.C. newspapers, which had little to say about their leaving, welcomed the students back as heroes.

Other Exemplary Programs

The Goddard Space Center Program selected 38 high school students who were interested in science and came from low income families. Each student was assigned as an apprentice to one of 38 Department Supervisors at the Goddard Space Center for eight summer weeks. Students attended from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. daily. They learned such technical skills as drafting, electrical circuitry, meterology, computer operations, biological laboratory work, welding, and electronic measurement with instruments. They utilized these skills to assist in the job area to which they were assigned and were paid $1.40 per hour for the entire eight weeks. This assisted their low-income families as well as their own morale. Students in this one-to-one apprenticeship also received weekly seminars about the world of work and training in being interviewed for a job. Follow-up studies of the 25 students in the 1967 Summer Enrichment Program showed that 22 of them won college scholarships and that all 22 are presently in their college programs.

This program was exemplary. Participation of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia was less than exemplary. Only $3,500 in Summer Enrichment Program funds were awarded to this program, to pay for the students' bus transportation. If more funds were available, specifically the $1.40 per hour paid to the students from low-income families, an additional 76 students could have received such apprenticeships. However, there were insufficient funds to accept the 76 qualified students even though the Goddard Space Center Department Supervisors had volunteered their services.

The Gonzaga Summer School Higher Achievement Project selected 60 students entering the 8th or 9th grade who had good academic potential but were underachieving, had a reading grade level below their potential, and came from low-income and "low motivation" families. The 60 students were given intensive college preparatory academic work supplemented with culturally enriching field trips and daily guidance in study techniques. The program staff of 12 had one week of pre-planning, provided individualized academic instructions, and had weekly staff meetings to discuss and evaluate each student. Milk and doughnut breakfasts as well as free lunches were provided for all students. Fifty-nine students successfully completed the program. One pupil had to leave after four weeks to get a job because his family had no income. At the end of the program a report on the accomplishments of each student was sent to his respective regular school in time to be used in September 1970.

The Summer Camping Program provided 320 low income family students, in grades four through six, with two weeks of enriching academic and natural environment experiences in the Catoctin Mountain National Park. It was a first camping experience for most of the inner-city students. The days were split with one-half devoted to reading, science, mathematics, social studies, and singing and the other half day devoted to activities such as hiking, fishing, and overnight camping. The children were encouraged to work together and develop personal and group responsibilities. Individual reports were kept which included information and rating scales on each student's "reading ability", "interest in math, science, social studies, arts and crafts, and music", "personality", "camping experiences and contacts with nature", and "general attitude toward learning". The 320 students completed the program with general gains in reading, verbal expressiveness, and interest in further camping experiences.

The George Washington University Workshops for Careers in the Arts selected 170 talented students, in grades eight through twelve, from 600 applicants for workshop courses in dance, drama, visual arts, and film making. The students were taught by and worked with professionally trained teachers who were also working artists. In addition to intensive classes in the arts, students also observed professional performances, visited professional companies and rehearsals, visited art galleries and exhibited at the Corcoran, traveled to New York to observe and perform at the Lincoln Center, Prospect Park, and Morningside Park, visited a Broadway show production, and completed their own film. The program received very favorable newspaper coverage and community support for their "Everyman" Street Theatre which had ten scheduled performances on ten main street areas of Washington, D.C. Audiences participated, the local communities were

favorably involved, and the police and other city officials cooperated. With the assistance of the project's placement services, every high school graduate who completed this 1970 Summer Enrichment Program was accepted in either an art school or college. Several students also won important full scholarships.

Exemplary Aspects of Programs

Different kinds of things can make a program, or aspects of a program, exemplary. For example, the Smithsonian Art Workshop provided talented art students with their own studio space and instructions from professional working artists.

Without any clerical or aide help, the teachers in the Primary Summer Schools sent a pupil achievement report, with individualized details about each pupil, to the respective schools of their 2,237 students in time to be used by their teachers in September 1970. It was exemplary that in six weeks, the Summer Dropout Program was able to contact 1,326 school dropouts, provide services for 1,268 of them, and send detailed case reports to each student's respective school by August 5th. Exemplary describes the Anacostia Project's program to train 105 Community Reading Assistants with in-service staff development while up-grading the reading abilities of 750 elementary school pupils. With a staff of only five, Widening Horizons arranged culturally enriching tours for 7,500 students, at 84 field tour locations, by utilizing the services of 250 parent and community volunteers; such massive use of community volunteers certainly represents exemplary community involvement. In each of these cases, a program's particularly outstanding accomplishment or aspect can serve as a model of achievement, effectiveness, or efficiency for accomplishing something important.

Some of the Summer Enrichment Programs had exemplary plans to accomplish important objectives but achieved only partial success through no fault of the program staff. For example, the purpose of the Webster Girls' School -- "to enable pregnant school-age girls to continue their education while awaiting delivery of their child and to encourage them to complete their high school education after the birth of the child" -- had only partial success because of lacking funds and resources. This was a fine program run by good qualified people. But the classrooms were often inhumanely hot and humid, there were no funds for needed home visiting teachers, and many of the girls didn't have money for lunch or transportation costs. So the attendance averaged only 60 students per day and five girls dropped out of the program.

The Cultural Arts Program had an exemplary multi-arts plan "to group the art courses in a cluster so that learnings which students derive from one discipline might increase and reinforce learnings from other disciplines". The program had five courses for this purpose: visual arts, dance, music, theatre arts, and creative writing. The trouble was that funds were insufficient to provide enough time for students to take more than two art forms, the funds could not be used until one week after the program started which precluded adequate staff selection, preparation, and

equipment, and only one secretary was provided for 52 staff members and 1,027 students. This program was good anyway. But it could have been fully exemplary, in keeping with its plans, if the resources it deserved had been provided.

Some Summer Enrichment Programs were exemplary in providing vocational orientation or career experiences to help students plan more realistically. The Summer Vocational Orientation Program gave 300 students the opportunity to learn about occupational trades which do not require college. Urban Communications at American University provided professional instructions and excellent opportunities for 80 high school students to demonstrate their skills and talents for possible careers in journalism or broadcasting. The Trinity College Summer Middle School provided the kind of academic program for Title I students that could not only enrich them academically, but also increase their enjoyment of and desire for future education.

Research and Innovation

The best examples of exemplary Summer Enrichment Program planning for research and innovation, in these cases innovation into the regular school program, were the three Science programs. These were staff development programs to prepare three groups of elementary or junior high school teachers to use innovative science curricula in their respective schools beginning in September 1970.

The three programs -- "Introductory Physical Science" for the 8th and 9th grades, "Science Curriculum Improvement Study" for grades one through six, and "Time, Space, and Matter" for grades seven and eight -- planned to accomplish their staff development objectives with actual model classes of science students while concurrently providing the students with a superior science education program. One program prepared 30 teachers from 30 schools, one program prepared 29 teachers from 29 schools, and the third program prepared 34 teachers and 24 principals or assistant principals. In each case the model class for practice teaching consisted of students of the same age group as the participants would be teaching. Each of the programs was held at a local university. All participants were paid stipends plus dependent allowances.

The teacher participants attended the program full time. For half the day, they had classes or seminars with specialist and laboratory instructors, guest consultants, and lecturers to learn skills, techniques, strategies, subject content, and become familiar with the materials of the program. They reviewed the developmental and psychological aspects of learning the science subjects pertinent to their respective students' age levels. In addition to lectures, seminars and laboratories, they had field trips and special workshops with video tape analyses of their teaching styles in the demonstration classes. The other half day the participants observed and took turns teaching the demonstration class where the pupils were instructed by a regular teacher highly qualified to teach the innovative science curriculum.

The program was successfully completed by all teacher and principal participants and all pupils in all three programs. The pupils learned at least as much as from any regular science course and seemed to gain extra interest and enthusiasm. All junior high school students received regular junior high school credit for their course.

All teacher participants qualified to receive three to six graduate credits from the respective university where their program was held, i.e., Howard University, Catholic University, or Federal City College, for their successful participation. Every teacher participant was considered capable and ready to innovate the new curriculum in her regular school in September 1970. There will be monthly follow-up studies of the teacher participants, throughout the school year, to determine their capabilities and degrees of success with the new science curriculums.

This kind of well-planned, carefully carried out, and adequately followed up program is an exemplary model that should be considered for other innovative curricula possibilities in other subject areas. Certainly the students in Public Schools of the District of Columbia could benefit from programs like this in reading, other language arts, and mathematics.

CHAPTER 41

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

Recommendation No. 1

All funding should be made known to Summer Enrichment Program planners early enough for adequate planning, staff recruitment, staff and program preparation, the ordering of supplies, and student selection. This generally means that the amount of funds that will be approved must be made known by April 15th at the very latest. March 15th or earlier would be very much better and could probably save funds through efficiency.

Approval after April 15th has, in 1970, caused waste in many programs because of the resulting mad scramble to find qualified staff, and insufficient time to adequately plan programs, prepare staff and select students, or to order supplies which sometimes arrived too late to be used.

Recommendation No. 2

Each Summer Enrichment Program proposal for funding should clearly spell out its objectives, planned procedures, expected outcomes, and evaluation strategies. It should include details of contemplated staff and student selection, program and curriculum plans, needed supplies and equipment, necessary publicizing in the community, relationships with regular school or other programs, planned reports, and all expected costs from summer enrichment and other fund sources. Whoever becomes the director of a program should be held responsible for carrying out or accounting for such program requirements.

The proposal should be submitted early enough to permit revision if it is initially disapproved or provisionally approved. It seems reasonable that since most program planners want funding approval at least two months before their program begins, all proposals should be submitted at least two months before April 15th.

Recommendation No. 3

If well planned proposals for Summer Enrichment Programs are submitted on time, their approval should include enough funds and enough

program time to carry out their stated objectives. It should be recognized that some programs will require full days and/or longer than the usual six weeks. Program requirements in terms of student needs should take priority over any attempt to make all programs conform to the usual half-day six week summer maximum.

Recommendation No. 4

There should be good free lunches for all students attending Summer Enrichment Programs even though they attend for only half a day. Since students may not have a lunch waiting for them at home, because for many students such a lunch may be their most nutritious daily meal, and because teachers may be unable to or not want to single out students in need of the meal, a good lunch should be available for all participating students. Where applicable, and if possible, a simple breakfast or extra snack should also be considered.

Recommendation No. 5

Students attending Summer Enrichment Programs should have free transportation to and from the program. When parents are requested to participate, or to come for special services, their public transportation costs should also be reimbursed if possible.

Recommendation No. 6

District of Columbia Public School students should not be requested or encouraged to solicit funds to add to the budgets of their Summer Enrichment Programs. Program directors seeking multiple funding should be commended. But such fund seeking should be completed before the program begins; otherwise, good program planning and administration are likely to suffer.

Recommendation No. 7

Fire laws and common sense should be considered before locking and chaining school exit doors. Resolving the reasons for such procedures should be given immediate and intensive attention by teachers, parents, students, and the community.

Recommendation No. 8

Insufficient attention and recognition have been given to encourage scholastic excellence. Students have special programs and are rewarded for

remedial accomplishments and avoiding trouble. Attention and rewards should also be given to encourage exemplary quality and achievement and to enhance the image of the good student as a goal. If reformed drug addicts can return as heroes to lecture students, how about 60 scholarship winners telling their peers about the adventures of their awarded trip to Africa or Europe?

Recommendation No. 9

All future school buildings should be air-conditioned. All presently used school buildings should have air conditioning installed as expeditiously as possible. Buildings which cannot be air-conditioned should not be used for summer programs or should have window conditioners installed in the few classrooms actually used.

Recommendation No. 10

There should be an educationally sound use of lessons and materials which include Black people's history, culture, and individual accomplishments. However this should be based upon truth, should neither over-dominate nor understate, and should emphasize the value of people's relatedness rather than their chauvinistic differences.

Recommendation No. 11

It is recommended that funds be included in Summer Enrichment Program budgets for essential clerical help. First consideration should be given to qualified high school seniors. Such jobs should be announced in all District of Columbia high schools by May 1st or earlier.

Recommendation No. 12

Future Summer Enrichment Program planners should include in their proposals the kinds of student achievement and other data that will be sent to students' respective regular schools; or, the proposal should specify why this is not applicable or should not be done.

Recommendation No. 13

Follow-up studies needed to evaluate Summer Enrichment Program effectiveness, and to plan future programs, should be included in the original proposals. This would establish the funding and responsibility, as well as the essential pre-planning, for such studies.

Recommendation No. 14

There should be more permanent staff available to help relate the Summer Enrichment Programs to the regular school programs. This would help achieve better student, staff, and curriculum selections for the summer programs. The desired relationship between the regular school programs and the Summer Enrichment Programs should be spelled out in the latter's proposals before funding is approved.

Recommendation No. 15

Whenever warranted, regular junior and senior high school credits should be given to students for completed Summer Enrichment Program work.

Recommendation No. 16

Future Summer Enrichment Program proposals should include clear self-evaluation plans based upon clearly stated program objectives and procedures. Each program director should be able to identify his program's strengths and weaknesses in terms of pupil achievement and be able to recommend, where applicable, improvements for the future design of similar programs. Follow-up information of pupil achievement may be necessary for some programs and, if so, should be budgeted.

Recommendation No. 17

There should be an expanded summer program of good quality apprenticeships related to careers which do not require college as well as those which do. The Goddard Space Center Program may be considered as a suggestive model.

Recommendation No. 18

The three staff development programs, "Introductory Physical Science", "Science Curriculum Improvement Study", and "Time, Space, and Matter" should be considered as suggestive models to develop staff for remedial or improved curricula in reading, other language arts, and mathematics.

Recommendation No. 19

There should be more summer camping opportunities for Title I and other very poor inner-city students. The 1970 Summer Camping Program

may be considered as a suggestive model for its approach to combine experiences with nature, academic enrichment, and group living responsibilities. The entire summer, from the time school closes until it resumes in September, and if possible the Easter vacation period too, should be utilized for this purpose.

Recommendation No. 20

The D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra's 1970 Summer Enrichment Program could have offered many possibilities for graduate students to study intensively the extraordinary degrees of educational program effectiveness, interest, and morale. There seem to be enough possible values for the District of Columbia Public Schools, as well as for university sponsored research, to warrant such cooperative study efforts in 1971.

* * * * * * *

Because of the reality of the present, severely limited, District of Columbia budget, the following recommendations are suggested for future consideration. However, this does not imply any diminished importance of the recommendations.

Recommendation No. 21

The efforts of many groups and individuals, including the director of The George Washington University Workshops for Careers in the Arts Program, to establish a District of Columbia High School for the Arts seems warranted, long overdue, and is strongly recommended. Such a high school would attract highly qualified teachers and students. It should be designed specifically for the arts, with studios, rehearsal halls, stages, sound, video and film recording systems, and other special space and equipment requirements. For these reasons it definitely should be designated and planned for one of the next high schools to be built and not be attempted by remodeling some old school. In the major cities which have such a high school for the arts, academic achievement in the various non-art subjects generally exceeds the level of most other high schools.

Recommendation No. 22

There should be several large summer "Recreation Parks" for inner-city children with free meals, including breakfast, and bus transportation. In the evening, parents should be able to join their children at supper and participate in swimming or other activities. There should be equipped playing fields, graduated swimming pools extending approximately 200 yards by three or four hundred yards, and varied recreational facilities

including meeting rooms and an outdoor theatre. With such resources, the Summer Enrichment Programs that are mostly recreational could be discontinued and the staff utilized at these parks instead of continuing in the hot, humid, old school buildings.

Recommendation No. 23

There should be a two or three day summer Student Arts Festival, perhaps on Labor Day weekend. It could be held, for example, in available space at the Smithsonian Institute or other government buildings or under rented tents near Carter Barron or on the Mall. Students in the various arts programs could exhibit their paintings and other visual arts work, the D.C. Youth Symphony Orchestra could have evening concerts, student dance and theatre arts groups could schedule performances, and journalism and broadcasting students could provide publicity and reviews. Special scholarship awards and prizes could be presented by the mayor. Local newspapers and other media would certainly cooperate. It could be a District of Columbia event that is truly something for students to work for and remember.